

NEW SERIES

FATHERS' RECREATION ROOM
PLEASE DO NOT TAKE TO
PRIVATE ROOM
Vol. XV, No. 3

THE CLERGY REVIEW

SEPTEMBER, 1938

CONTENTS INCLUDE

**PAROCHIAL BENEFICES IN ENGLAND
AND WALES**

BY REV. L. L. McREAVY

SIMON THE PETROS

BY REV. E. C. MESSENGER

**THE "PROFESSIO FIDEI" MADE ON
RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH**

BY REV. M. BÉVENOT, S.J.

HOMILETICS

BY REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

- I—ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY
II—SOCIOLOGY AND ECONOMICS

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

REVIEWS, &c.

LONDON

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.

PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE

43-45 NEWGATE STREET, E.C.1

Price Two Shillings Net

Fifty Contributors
to
THE TABLET
this year

F. Britten Austin
Denzil Batchelor
Hilaire Belloc
M. Bévenot, S.J.
Roy Campbell
Lucien Corpechot
Rupert Croft-Cooke
M. C. D'Arcy, S.J.
Christopher Dawson
Alfonso de Zulueta
Paul Gentizon
Thomas Gilby, O.P.
Graham Greene
T. S. Gregory
Cecily Hallack
Kevin Hayes
Christopher Hollis
Henry Hope
Philip Hughes
Douglas Jerrold
H. J. T. Johnson
David Jones
Ronald Knox
C. R. Leetham, Inst.Ch.
P. C. Loftus, M.P.

J. C. Marsh-Edwards
J. Lewis May
J. H. McEwen, M.P.
George Moenius
Douglas Newton
Richard O'Sullivan
A. A. Parker
E. Allison Peers
T. Phillips, S.J.
Hugh Pope, O.P.
John Pope-Hennessy
E. R. Roper Power
Edward Quinn
J. P. Rowland, S.J.
Robert Sencourt
Walter Shewring
George N. Shuster
Robert Speaight
R. H. J. Steuart, S.J.
W. R. Thompson, F.R.S.
Herbert Thurston, S.J.
Michael Trappes-Lomax
F. M. R. Walshe
E. I. Watkin
Douglas Woodruff

Send a postcard for free specimen copy to-day

The Tablet, 39 Paternoster Row, E.C.4



THE CLERGY REVIEW

Chairman of the Editorial Board :

Most Reverend Archbishop Downey

Editor :

Very Reverend T. E. Flynn, V.F.

Submission of articles of direct practical interest to the pastoral clergy is invited. Submission of cases in Moral Theology, Canon Law, and Liturgy is invited, also *dubia* in Dogmatic Theology and Holy Scripture. Correspondence on solutions that have appeared, and on any matters of pastoral interest, is invited.

Matter offered for publication may be sent direct, to save time, to the Editor at St. Mary's, Chorley, Lancs.

Other correspondence should be sent to the Manager,

THE CLERGY REVIEW

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.

43-45 NEWGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.1

Subscription Rates for twelve monthly numbers :

£1 OR FIVE DOLLARS POST FREE
SINGLE NUMBERS TWO SHILLINGS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SEPTEMBER 1938

ARTICLES

| | |
|--|-------------|
| (1) Parochial Benefices in England and Wales | PAGE 189 |
| BY REV. LAWRENCE LESLIE McREAVY, D.C.L., M.A. | |
| (2) Simon The <i>Petros</i> | 203 |
| BY REV. E. C. MESSENGER, PH.D. | |
| (3) The "Professio Fidei" made on Reception into the Church | 212 |
| BY REV. M. BÉVENOT, S.J. | |

HOMILETICS :

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| The Sundays of October | 226 |
| BY REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J. | |

NOTES ON RECENT WORK :

| | |
|--|-----|
| (1) Ascetical and Mystical Theology | 238 |
| BY REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., PH.D., M.A. | |
| (2) Sociology and Economics | 242 |
| BY REV. E. J. COYNE, S.J. | |

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS :

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| (1) Parvitas Materiae (De VIo) | 249 |
| (2) Sixes at Benediction | 250 |
| (3) Eucharistic Fast | 251 |
| (4) The Last Blessing | 253 |
| (5) Reception of a Convert | 255 |
| (6) Venial Sin | 257 |
| (7) Freedom to Marry | 258 |
| (8) Certificate of Baptism | 260 |
| (9) Mass or Holy Communion ? | 262 |
| (10) Sale of a Chalice | 264 |

BY VERY REV. CANON E. J. MAHONEY,
D.D.

| | |
|-------------------|-----|
| ROMAN DOCUMENTS | 265 |
| CHURCH MANAGEMENT | 266 |
| BOOK REVIEWS | 269 |
| CORRESPONDENCE | 281 |

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XV, No. 3.

SEPT., 1938

PAROCHIAL BENEFICES IN ENGLAND AND WALES

WHEN, on 29 September, 1850, Pope Pius IX restored the episcopal hierarchy in England, it was intended that the ecclesiastical organization of this country should once more be brought into line with that of the Church as a whole; in other words, that there should be not only dioceses governed by diocesan bishops, but also parishes governed by *parochi* with all the rights and duties pertaining to their office.¹ It soon became evident, however, that a comprehensive system of parishes could not be established with the same expedition as episcopal sees, merely by a stroke of the pen. "For," wrote the Bishops assembled in synod, "we may neither define the limits of parishes nor canonically institute them, both because of the distance between the places which have churches, and because, in many cases, missions are served, not by churches, but by oratories attached to the houses of laymen, and also for other reasons which it would be idle to mention here."²

Representations were therefore made to the Holy See, with the result that, on 21 April, 1852, the S. Congregation of Propaganda issued a decree authorizing a compromise between the episcopal system and the missionary state.³ As a first step towards the desired goal, each bishop was to select in his diocese a number of churches to be administered as quasi-parishes by permanently fixed "mis-

¹ "We deemed that the time had come for the form of ecclesiastical government in England to be reconstituted after the manner obtaining freely in other nations where no special reason demands that they should be governed by the extraordinary means of Vicars Apostolic."—*Litt. Apost. Universalis Ecclesiae*; *Conc. Prov. Westm. I*, Appendix, pars II, i.

² *Conc. Prov. Westm. I*, decr. XIII.

³ *Conc. Prov. Westm. I*, Appendix, pars I, viii.

sionary rectors"; but meanwhile, in other churches or missions, "mere missionaries, removable at the bishop's pleasure", were to have charge of souls, "within the bounds temporarily assigned to each mission by the bishop."¹

This provisional system remained legally in force down to 29 September, 1908, when, by the Apostolic Constitution *Sapienti Consilio*, England was declared "exempt from the jurisdiction of the Congregation of Propaganda and subject again to the Common Law";² or, at most, down to 19 May, 1918, when the New Code came into force and, with it, the prescription of can. 216 that every diocese should be divided into distinct territorial parts called "parishes", each with its own particular church and rector.³ If any doubt still remained that the decree of 1852 no longer applied, it was finally and effectively removed by a declaration of the S. Congregation of the Consistory, of 1 August, 1919, "on the nature of the quasi-parishes or missions of certain dioceses after the promulgation of the Code of Canon Law", a document of such patent importance to our parochial clergy that it deserves to be quoted in full. It reads as follows :

Some doubts have been sent up from dioceses which, before the constitution *Sapienti Consilio*, were subject to the S. Congregation of Propaganda, but thereafter were transferred to the Common Law, concerning the nature of the parishes or missions into which the said dioceses were divided, and concerning the rights and duties of their rectors.

This Sacred Congregation, after consulting most of the Ordinaries of the said dioceses and duly weighing the matter, has decided to declare upon it as follows :

I. It is clear from can. 216 of the Code of Canon Law that the parts of the above-mentioned dioceses to which a

¹ *Conc. Prov. Westm.* I, decr. XIII, nn. 1, 2, 5.

² *A.A.S.*, vol. I, 1909, p. 12.

³ Can. 216, § 3, reserves the name "quasi-parishes" to the territorial divisions of vicariates and prefectures apostolic.

special rector has been assigned for the care of souls, must henceforth be considered as "parishes" and be called by that name; the name "quasi-parishes" or "missions" being reserved for the parts into which, for the care of souls, Apostolic Vicariates and Prefectures are divided.

II. For the constitution of parishes, there is indeed required a decree of the Ordinary determining the territorial boundaries, the parochial site, and the endowment both for worship and for the maintenance of the priest¹; nevertheless, it is not necessary that irremovability be accorded to the rector; in fact, given just reasons, *removability* can be declared in the actual decree of creation, in conformity with canons 1411, §4, 454, §3, and 1438.

III. If, however, the scanty or fluctuating number of the faithful, or the absolute lack of an adequate endowment should make the erection of certain churches into parishes inadvisable, let such churches be regarded as "subsidiaries" or "chaplains" within the boundaries of a parish, to which they shall remain subject and dependent until they can attain parochial status of their own.

IV. In constituting the endowment of parishes that are to be erected, the prescriptions of canons 1409, 1410, and 1415, §3, must be borne in mind.

V. Moreover, once a parish has been canonically erected, in the manner above described, the rector, be he *parochus* or *vicarius oeconomicus*, is bound by the obligation of applying the Mass *pro populo*; from which rectors of a subsidiary church or chaplaincy are exempt. If, however, this burden be found too heavy, recourse may be had to the Holy See for its opportune reduction.²

It follows, therefore, that the distinct divisions of English dioceses, which we once called "missions", are now canonical parishes administered by *parochi* in the full sense of the term. Furthermore, as we hope to show, all such parishes are parochial benefices. But, first, let us see what precisely is meant by the term "benefice".

¹ The nature of this "endowment" will be considered below.

² *A.A.S.*, vol. XI, 1919, p. 346. The "subsidiary churches" referred to are what we call "chapels-of-ease".

An ecclesiastical benefice is defined, in can. 1409, as "a juridical entity constituted or erected in perpetuity by competent ecclesiastical authority, consisting of a sacred office and the right to the endowment revenue attached to the office". The first requisite, perpetual erection as a separate, self-subsisting juridical entity, is clearly satisfied by all our independent parishes, and rules out only those subsidiary "mass-centres", referred to in section IV of the above decree, which have not as yet been cut off from the parent parish. The second requisite, that is to say, right to the endowment revenue attached to the sacred office, might seem, at first sight, to exclude many, if not most, of our parish priests from the category of beneficiaries; but only if we fail to take account of the special meaning of endowment in modern Canon Law.

Whatever may be the etymological sense of the word, historically, as applied to benefices, an endowment came to mean stable and fruitful property, usually landed property, belonging to the benefice, considered as a moral person, and providing revenue sufficient for the support of the beneficiary. The Church still prefers that the endowments of her benefices should be characterized by this objective stability; nevertheless, owing to the general spoliation of ecclesiastical property since the Reformation, there has been a constant tendency among canonists to widen the connotation of the term to meet changed circumstances, and that tendency has now received official sanction in can. 1410 of the Code of Canon Law.¹ So it is that among the various sources of

¹ "Licet dos assignata officio secundum historicum conceptum beneficii debeat esse constituta in bonis stabilibus et frugiferis, quorum proprietas seu dominium sit penes ipsum officium consideratum ut persona moralis; defectus fundationum pluribus in locis existens induxit necessitatem ampliandi dotis conceptum: quare Codex admisit (can. 1410) plures alios modos habendi officium ut dotatum et consequenter veri beneficii rationem induens."—Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonicum*, II, n. 141; Rome, 1928, p. 167.

revenue which, by can. 1410, can constitute the endowment of a benefice, we find enumerated not only property owned by the benefice, and assured payments due from a family or moral person, but also "those voluntary and yet certain offerings of the faithful which are meant for the rector of the benefice", and even stole fees, as defined by diocesan law or custom.

To speak of an institution supported merely by voluntary offerings, however certain, as canonically "endowed", is to give the word a new meaning. And that, in fact, is what has happened. Indeed, it is no longer possible, in such instances, to distinguish the *reditus ex dote* from the *dos* itself, except by saying, as does Conte a Coronata, that the *dos* is then the good character and customs of the people ;¹ which is manifestly a mere legal fiction designed simply to smoothe over a radical change in the meaning of the word.

And if the Code, in can. 1410, has thus altered the meaning of "endowment" for benefices in general, it has gone even further, in can. 1415, to meet the special requirements of *parochial* benefices in particular. Can. 1415, after requiring, in § 1, that benefices *in general* shall not be erected without a stable and adequate endowment, and showing preference for funded property by prescribing, in § 2, that if the endowment consists of a sum of money, it should be invested in safe and fruitful property or stock, goes on, in § 3, to establish a notable exception in favour of one particular form of benefices, namely, parishes. Realizing that here it is the spiritual element, the care of souls, that is of paramount importance, and that the good of souls may demand the erection of a separate parish, for the benefice of which no adequate endowment, even in the wide sense of can. 1410, can yet be found, the legislator derogates from the ordinary rule and declares that such a parish may be founded as long as it is prudently

¹ *Institutiones Iuris Canonici*, II, n. 974 ; Turin, 1931, p. 361.

foreseen that its needs will be met in some way or other. To take a not uncommon example, a bishop may cut off a district hitherto served by a chapel-of-ease, and erect it as a parish, provided he appoints a separate rector and guarantees his maintenance (at least until he can make a living there) from some such source as a Poor Mission Fund.

Fanfani, while admitting that such foundations are parishes, denies them the right to be called parochial benefices, on the ground that they are erected "*absque dote*".¹ But we cannot help feeling that his judgment on this point is prejudiced by the traditional stability of the endowments with which he is familiar in Italy, and have no hesitation in adopting the contrary opinion of equally authoritative writers.² We would say that the legislator, not content with extending the meaning of *dos* to meet the modern requirements of despoliated benefices in general (can. 1410), has thought fit to make this further extension in favour of parochial benefices (can. 1415, § 3), precisely because here something so much more important than the mere security of the beneficiary is at stake. And, in any case, a parish for which it is prudently foreseen that the necessary "living" of the rector will not be wanting, can hardly be said to be altogether "*absque dote*", at least in the wide modern sense of the word.³

Moreover, this opinion is backed by the highest authority. In a letter of 26 September, 1921, to the Apostolic Delegate in the United States, Cardinal

¹ *De Iure Parochorum*, n. 10; Rome, 1924, p. 15.

² Cappello, *Summa Iuris Canonici*, II, n. 867, Rome, 1934, p. 546; Conte a Coronata, *op. cit.*, II, n. 978; and, though less explicitly, Wernz-Vidal, *op. cit.*, II, n. 141.

³ E.J.M., writing to this effect in the *CLERGY REVIEW*, XIII, p. 30, finds, nevertheless, an apparent contradiction between can. 1410 and can. 1415, § 3. I see none. Can. 1415, § 1, dealing with benefices in general, requires an endowment of the variable type laid down in can. 1410, for benefices in general. Can. 1415, § 3, legislating solely for parochial benefices, and in view of their peculiar needs and special importance, gives a yet wider interpretation of the endowment sufficient for such benefices. It is an extension or derogation rather than an apparent contradiction.

Gasparri, then president of the Pontifical Commission for the interpretation of the Code, explicitly stated "that a parish is always an ecclesiastical benefice according to can. 1411, 5^o, whether it has the proper endowment (resources or revenue), as described and defined in can. 1410, or even if, lacking such endowment (resources or revenue) it be erected according to the provisions of can. 1415, § 3." The Cardinal added that no special decree of the Ordinary was necessary to constitute as canonical parishes those which had been established before the Code in the manner described, and that such parishes became canonical parishes (and therefore parochial benefices) *ipso facto* on the promulgation of the Code.¹ It is true that this is a particular declaration, official only for the U.S.A. to which it was directed, but since English conditions are practically identical, we can conclude with moral certainty that all missions in this country, with a clearly defined territory and resident rector, are not only parishes, but parochial benefices.

There remains, nevertheless, the difficulty of determining what exactly constitutes their endowment. To appreciate this difficulty and to understand the law concerning the disposal of endowment revenue, it is essential to realize that Canon Law draws a precise distinction between the "*dos beneficii*", the revenue of which supports the beneficiary, and the "*dos ecclesiae*" which provides for the upkeep of the church and divine worship. Now, although there may be one or two parishes in England in which there is a separate endowment (property or assured payment) specially set apart for the maintenance of the priest (the needs of the parish being met from other sources), nevertheless, the fact remains that in the vast majority of cases there is no such distinction. The "voluntary

¹ From a letter of the Apostolic Delegate to the hierarchy of the U.S.A., quoted in Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, p. 149-151.

and yet assured offerings of the faithful" constitute *indeterminately* the endowment both of the priest and of the parish. There may be property (e.g. houses bearing rent), but it is parish property, *bona ecclesiastica* rather than *bona beneficalia*, and the revenue from it simply swells the common fund.

Voluntary offerings can, of course, constitute the separate endowment of the beneficiary, but, as can. 1410 explains, only to the extent in which they are intended for the rector.¹ So, for example, in Australia, there are, we understand, two separate collections or offertories, one for the rector and one for the needs of the parish. If the same were true of England, the rector's offertory could constitute his benefice. But we have no such custom: the faithful do not distinguish their offerings; they simply contribute indiscriminately for the needs of the parish (one of which is understood to be the maintenance of the parish priest), and leave any further distinctions to ecclesiastical authority.

In order, therefore, to determine the beneficial endowment, or, more properly, the beneficial revenue (*fructus beneficales*) of a parish priest in this country, we must turn to those provincial and diocesan laws which supply the distinction lacking in the donations, as at present made, and settle the share of general parish revenue to which he has a right.² The chief of these, until the statutes of the next Plenary Council come into force, is Decree VIII of the Second Provincial Council of Westminster. It provides as follows:

1. Offerings of the faithful for the propagation and ornament of religion, for the support of the clergy, the relief of the poor and other pious uses, are considered as

¹ "Certae et voluntariae fidelium oblationes, quae ad beneficii rectorem spectent," can. 1410.

² There is nothing extraordinary in this. It is for ecclesiastical authority not for the beneficiary to decide what precisely shall constitute the endowment of a benefice, with due regard, of course, to the will of the founders or donors. Cf. Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, II, n. 743; ed. 4a, p. 463.

made to God and the Church; and the administrators or guardians of them, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, are to be deemed merely dispensers of them, under obligation of rendering an account to God of their stewardship . . .

9. In every mission, where money is contributed by the faithful in the ways hereafter described,¹ it is to be accounted Church property, and not a donation to the priest. For from this money he must provide not only for his own decent support, but for the expense of religious worship, for the maintenance of the fabric, for payment of debts, where there are any, and for other wants . . .

11. Whatever money comes to the mission by these means (i.e. the ways described in No. 10 of this decree), it should be considered as belonging not to the priest personally, but to the general wants of the mission. Therefore, whatever furniture, either sacred or domestic, he acquires from these sources, or whatever he expends in keeping in repair the church or other buildings in any way belonging to it, in this expenditure, he is not making provision for himself, but is providing for the mission from mission property.²

Applying this statute to the present discipline of the Code in the matter of benefices,³ we see that the *fructus beneficiales* (i.e. the proportion of parish revenue to which the parish priest has a right) are defined for England and Wales as the amount which the beneficiary needs for his honest maintenance. All the rest is parish property (*bona ecclesiastica*), of which the parish priest is simply the steward and which he must administer in accordance with canons 1518-1528,

¹ Section No. 10 gives a qualified approval to five ways, viz. bench rents, offertory collections, admission charges to certain parts of the seating, charity sermons, and outdoor collections.

² Guy, *The Synods in English*, pp. 159-161.

³ Pre-code particular laws remain in force to the extent in which they can be reconciled with the general law of the Code (can. 6). The decree in question, far from being opposed to the Code, is required by it, as being the only way of determining the destination of the undetermined offerings of the faithful.

⁴ Canons 1476-1482, which deal with the administration of *bona beneficalia*, are only partly applicable in England, because they suppose a *dos beneficii* distinct from the *dos ecclesiae*. In the average English parish there are no *bona beneficalia*, only *bona ecclesiastica*.

the prescriptions of the above-mentioned decree and the laws of his own diocese.

As to what is comprised by "honest maintenance", no fixed rules can be given other than those to be found in diocesan statutes. According to some Continental authors, it may include not only what is necessary to feed, clothe and house the beneficiary himself, but also reasonable hospitality to friends and the poor, settlement of legitimate debts and helping the education of relatives.¹ But it must be remembered that these authors are envisaging the system in which the beneficiary draws his living from a separate fund and has no statutory salary drawn from parish revenue. In England, on the contrary, since there is no such separate fund, diocesan laws have universally assigned to the parish priest, in addition to his keep, a fixed annual stipend, precisely in order to cover some at least of those incidental expenses which authors consider to be part and parcel of an honest maintenance.

Unfortunately, diocesan laws seldom make it clear which of these incidental expenses are regarded as part of the priest's keep, and which are meant to be covered by the allotted stipend. Normally, we would say that reasonable hospitality, medical attention and such items as the running expenses of a car required for parish work are part of his keep, whereas settlement of avoidable personal debts and monetary help to his relatives must be met from his stipend or from other private resources. For the rest, until plenary, provincial or diocesan law is more explicit, he may safely be guided by the general and honest customs of his own diocese.²

The fact that, in England and Wales, the *fructus*

¹ Conte a Coronata, *op. cit.*, II, n. 1017; Noldin, *De Praeceptis*, n. 782; Cocchi, *Commentarium in Codicem Iuris Canonici*, VI, n. 141.

² For example, it would seem that the scope and purpose of the stipend must be estimated more widely in a diocese where it is fixed at £90 than in a diocese where it is fixed at £50.

beneficiales of a parochial benefice (i.e. the amount of parish revenue accruing to the parish priest) are determined by law for all parishes in general, and not, as in most countries, by the founders or donors for each parish in particular, results of course in certain canonical peculiarities. The first and most evident of these is that, in theory at least, there is no difference between the emoluments of the several benefices, since for all beneficiaries alike they amount only to maintenance and stipend. This uniformity, however, as everyone knows, is juridical rather than real. In actual practice, the difference is often considerable, not only because of the local variations of Mass stipends, stole fees and other personal offerings, but also because, honest maintenance being a relative quantity, the rector of a well-provided parish may reasonably allow himself a more generous standard of maintenance than that attainable by the rector of a struggling parish. In the final issue, therefore, the only real uniformity between parochial emoluments in an English diocese is that of the parish priest's annual stipend.

A further peculiarity of English parochial benefices is revealed when we try to apply to them the law which regulates a beneficiary's disposal of his emoluments. According to this law (can. 1473), "the beneficiary, even though he may have other property than that of his benefice, can freely use such of the *fructus beneficiales* as may be necessary to his honest maintenance, *but is under obligation to expend the residue ('superflua') on the poor or on pious causes*".

To understand this important canon properly, it must again be borne in mind that the legislator is dealing with *fructus beneficiales* derived from an endowment established to support the beneficiary (*dos beneficii*) and distinct from that which maintains the parish (*dos ecclesiae*). The effect of the canon is, therefore, that although the beneficiary is owner of

all the ordinary fruits derived from his beneficial endowment,¹ his free disposal of this revenue is strictly limited to the amount he needs for his keep. It is indeed left to him to choose the poor or the pious causes which are to benefit by the residue (if any), but in no case may he appropriate it for himself or his heirs. The reason is, of course, that the donors of the endowment intended primarily to benefit religion by maintaining an office-holder, and not to enrich the beneficiary personally or his heirs.

The obligation, though grave in grave matter, is probably not one of justice, and, needless to say, it applies only to the residue of the *fructus beneficiales*; for the Code lays no restriction on the beneficiary's use of revenue derived from profane sources or even from spiritual sources other than the benefice. Nor does the law regard as residue the little he may save from his fair maintenance allowance by living more sparingly; such *bona parsimonialia*, as they are called, are his own to dispose of as he pleases.

Taken thus within the terms of its reference, the canon is quite clear. But how are we to apply it to English conditions? In the average English parochial benefice, as we have seen, the only determination of the *fructus beneficiales* is that made by particular law; and our law is so phrased that, although there can be *bona parsimonialia*, there can be no *bona superflua*. Were it to decree that the parish priest's beneficial revenue should consist of, let us say, one third of the total parish income, there would be room for residue. But it does not. It defines it as the amount he needs for maintenance (the annual stipend being included under this title), and consequently precludes the possibility of there being any beneficial revenue over and above what he needs for maintenance. All except what he needs is parish revenue. There may

¹ Even in countries where there is a separate endowment for the beneficiary, he is not the owner of it, but merely the usufructuary or administrator, his ownership being limited to the revenue from it.

be a superfluity from parish revenue, as, for example, when the faithful contribute more than is necessary for the needs both of the parish and of the parish priest, but that is not the superfluity referred to in can. 1473.

Nevertheless, although can. 1473 cannot be applied directly in all its details to English parochial benefices, it has an indirect effect of considerable importance. For not only does it tally in principle with our local law and custom in limiting the beneficiary's perquisites to honest maintenance, but it also goes far to remove the disparity between our system of uniformly determined *fructus beneficiales* and the traditional system of variable livings. In countries where the traditional system still exists, one parish priest may draw considerably more than another in beneficial revenue; but, if can. 1473 be honestly applied, he will be little better off personally. He may be more sure of decent maintenance, or have more residue to expend in alms, but that is all. As the law stands, there should be no greater (if no less) difference between the personal benefits of "Continental" parish priests than there is between the personal benefits of English parish priests. Cardinals apart,¹ there is no beneficiary, the world over, who may lawfully enrich himself or his heirs from the revenues of his benefice.

A final point. As we have already indicated, a beneficiary under the traditional system who appropriates the residue that he should expend in alms, sins gravely (given grave matter) against canonical obedience, but probably not against justice, and therefore is not bound to restitution. The reason for this is that, although the Church regulates the beneficiary's disposal of his beneficial revenue, the whole sum, *bona superflua* no less than *bona necessaria*,

¹ Can. 1473 admits only one exception, namely, can. 239, § 1, 19°, which allows Cardinals "to dispose freely of beneficial revenue, even by testament".

is really and truly his property, not parish property, and therefore, if he fails to expend the *superflua* as the law prescribes, he is guilty of breaking the law but not of misappropriation. In England, on the contrary, since a parish priest's beneficial revenue consists simply of the amount of parish money needed for his keep (including stipend), it is clear that he cannot go beyond this limit without misappropriation and therefore injustice, because any excess which he appropriates is necessarily taken from parish funds, of which he is not owner but merely administrator.

This is evidently a matter of considerable moment to our parish priests and deserves serious reflexion. At the same time, to avoid scruples, it must be remembered that honest maintenance is a term of variable extension, and that a beneficiary who lives more sparingly than custom and statute require of him, may justly claim the difference as his own lawful savings. The question of restitution, therefore, will only arise if the beneficiary appropriates parish revenue to a degree notably in excess of what is comprised by honest maintenance.

LAWRENCE LESLIE McREAVY.

SIMON THE *PETROS*

IT has often been pointed out by Catholic apologists that, if there is one person who is prominent in the New Testament, it is, after Jesus Christ our Lord, his disciple Simon Peter. Thus, in the Gospels, St. Peter is mentioned ninety-one times, whereas the name of St. John, the next in prominence, occurs only thirty-eight times. But to the discerning reader of the New Testament there are many other indications of the importance of St. Peter and his office, and it is with some of these indications that I propose to deal in this article.

Attention might be called, in the first place, to the fact that, like Our Lord Himself, St. Peter is almost always accorded the article when his name occurs in the Greek Testament. Thus, just as we have ὁ Ἰησοῦς, so also we have ὁ Πέτρος. It would doubtless be unwise to attach too much importance to this fact, inasmuch as the principles which govern the use of the Greek article in the case of proper names in the New Testament are not too clear. Even so, authorities seem to agree that the use of the article has an emphatic or demonstrative force, so that we might translate ὁ Πέτρος as "this Peter", or "the Peter already mentioned".

But there is a far more interesting parallel between the treatment of the names of Our Lord and of St. Peter in the Greek Testament. Both Our Lord and his chief disciple have a *personal* name, and also an *official* one. Our Lord's personal name is Jesus; the name of his office is Christ. It is clear that our Lord was known to all as "Jesus of Nazareth", that is, by his personal name. On the other hand, He was recognized to be the Christ by a few only. It is this distinction between the personal and the official names which brings out the importance of St. Peter's great confession of Our Lord's divinity, in the words :

"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. xvi, 16). Other indications of the distinction between the personal and official names of Our Lord will be found up and down the Gospels. Thus, at the end of the genealogy in the first chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, we read of "Jesus, who is called the Christ". Our current English version omits to give the force of the Greek article here, for it translates: "Jesus who is called Christ". Surely, in view of the fact that "Christ" is, by general admission, the name of Our Lord's office, we should translate the article, and render the name "the Christ". The construction seems to be quite parallel to expressions such as "Herod the king", "John the Baptist", "Jonas the prophet", etc.

A final indication of the distinction between the personal and official name of Our Lord may be given. At his trial, He was asked: "If thou be the Christ, tell us." No one doubted that He was Jesus, but the question concerned his office as the Christ. Similarly, the rulers of the Jews mocked Our Lord when hanging on the Cross in these words: "Let him save himself, if He be the Christ, the elect of God." And lastly, the impenitent thief said to Our Lord: "If thou be the Christ, save thyself and us." It is a pity that in all these instances, the article before "Christ" is not translated in our current English versions.

It will be interesting now to see in what way Our Lord's personal and official names are used in the New Testament. As Our Lord is the Christ, we might expect to find the actual expression, "Jesus the Christ". Strangely enough, that expression does not occur. But we often find the combination of the personal and official names, without any article at all, i.e. "Jesus Christ". Thus, St. Matthew's Gospel speaks in its first verse of the "generation of Jesus Christ". St. Peter, in his first sermon (Acts ii, 38) tells his hearers to be "baptized in the name of Jesus

Christ". And St. Paul calls himself, in the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans, "a servant of Jesus Christ". But this cannot destroy the force and significance which as we have seen really belongs to the word "Christ". It remains true that this is the name of Our Lord's office, and so the expression "Jesus Christ" must really be equivalent to "Jesus the Christ", in spite of the absence of the article in the Greek. There are other indications which make it abundantly clear that the word "Christ" in the Greek, even without the article, denotes Our Lord's office. There is an illuminating sentence in St. Peter's first sermon (Acts ii, 36): "God hath made both Lord and Christ this same Jesus." In this text, there is no article before "Lord" or "Christ", but the construction makes it clear that both these terms are being used to denote Our Lord's office. Here is another instance of "Lord" being used without the article: "No man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost" (I Cor. xii, 3). (The Douai version has: "No man can say the Lord Jesus, etc." but this fails to give the real sense of the Greek.)

So far, then, we have found Our Lord described in the New Testament as "Jesus", "Jesus who is called the Christ", and "Jesus Christ", the latter expression being, as we maintain, the equivalent of "Jesus the Christ". There is yet another form in which Our Lord is named in the New Testament, and that is by his official name alone, without the personal name. Thus, we have in St. Matthew's Gospel the statement that from the transmigration of Babylon to "the Christ", there are fourteen generations. Again, Herod inquires where "the Christ" is to be born. And in the sacred Passion, we have the taunt: "Prophecy unto us, O Christ" (Matthew xxvi, 68). The single word "Christ", without any article, occurs often in the Epistles. Thus, St. Paul says in his First Epistle to the Corin-

thians, that some claim to be "of Christ", and later on in the same Epistle he speaks of the Church as "the body of Christ"; that "Christ died for our sins", and that "If Christ be not risen," etc. (I Cor. xv, 14.)

It would seem easy to arrange these various names in a logical order. Logically, the first name to be used would be the personal name, "Jesus". Then would come the combination of the personal and official names, as in the expression "Jesus Christ". And lastly, the increasing emphasis on Our Lord's office would lead to the name of the office being used even to denote the person, and thus we should get the term "Christ". The chronological sequence in the use of these names may have corresponded to the logical sequence, but it would not be easy to prove this. But at any rate it would seem most likely that the use of the official name "Christ" alone, came last.

Such is the result of an examination of the way in which Our Lord is named in the New Testament. If we now turn to the naming of St. Peter, we shall find that a most interesting and striking parallel exists. Thus, as we all know, St. Peter's personal name was Simon, just as Our Lord's personal name was Jesus. Our Lord was officially the Christ: similarly, Simon the son of Jona was to be the *Petros*, or *Kepha*, the Rock-man. And so, at the beginning of Our Lord's public ministry, He promises this new name to his disciple: "Thou art Simon, the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas", which is interpreted Peter (John i, 42). The actual conferring of the name, or at any rate the definitive confirmation of it, took place after St. Peter's great Confession. St. Peter had said: "Thou art the Christ", giving to Our Lord the name of His Office. Our Lord replies by giving to Simon, the son of Jona, the name of his new office in turn: "Blessed art thou, Simon, the son of Jona. . . . And I say unto thee that thou art

Peter. . . ." "Thou art Peter" corresponds to "Thou art Christ".

Now, we remarked on an earlier page, that Our Lord was known to all generally as "Jesus of Nazareth". And there is every reason to believe that his chief disciple was similarly known generally as "Simon". It would seem that, at any rate at first, "Peter" was used only by those who recognized Simon's office and position as the Petros, i.e. the rock-man. And just as Our Lord's personal name persisted, so also did that of his disciple. And thus it is a striking fact that, apart from the two texts in the Gospels in which Simon is first promised and then given the new name, Our Lord Himself throughout, when addressing his disciple by name, calls him by his personal name, except on one occasion, with which we shall deal presently. Thus, "Simon" is used in all the three great Petrine texts in the Gospels. In St. Matthew's Gospel, Our Lord says: "Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jona." In St. Luke (xxii, 31), Our Lord says: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you". And in St. John's Gospel, Our Lord asks three times: "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?" (John xxi, 15 et seq.) All this shows that, at any rate during Our Lord's lifetime, St. Peter was usually known by his personal name of Simon. It would seem that St. Peter's fellow disciples also knew him by his personal name, rather than the new official name. Thus, at the time of the Resurrection, the eleven Apostles said that "the Lord hath appeared to Simon" (Luke xxiv, 34). The personal name was evidently still in use at the time of the Council of Jerusalem, for St. James there used the expression: "Simon hath related . . ." (Acts xv, 14.)

But although Simon was St. Peter's personal name, his official name was bound to come into use. We should naturally expect the official name to

be used first of all in conjunction with the personal name. And it is interesting to note that just as we have the expression "Jesus, who is called the Christ", so also we have the expression "Simon, who is called the *Petros*". This occurs in St. Matthew when he is giving the list of the apostles: "The first, Simon, who is called the *Petros*". The use of the article is significant here, as St. Matthew continues: "And Andrew [without the article] the brother of him; and James" [without the article].

This expression, "Simon, who is called *Petros*", seems to make it quite clear that "*Petros*" is the name of an office, and not a personal name, and that it is thus parallel to "Jesus, who is called the Christ". The great Petrine text in Matthew shows that Simon is called the *Petros* because He is to be the foundation of the Church.

We can now carry the parallel between Our Lord and St. Peter a stage further. Just as "Jesus, who is called the Christ", develops into "Jesus Christ", which is equivalent to "Jesus the Christ", so also "Simon, who is called the *Petros*" develops into "Simon Peter", which is equivalent to "Simon the *Petros*". St. Matthew uses this composite form in the great Petrine text in chapter xvi: "Simon Peter answered and said . . ." The same form occurs several times in St. John's Gospel: "He cometh, therefore, to Simon Peter" (John xiii, 6); "Simon Peter, having a sword, drew it" (xviii, 10); "Simon Peter followed Jesus" (xviii, 15): "She cometh to Simon Peter" (xx, 2), etc. We may also note that the Second Epistle of St. Peter begins: "Simon Peter, servant and apostle of Jesus Christ". On the analogy of the composite term "Jesus Christ", equivalent to "Jesus the Christ", we infer that "Simon Peter" is equivalent to "Simon the *Petros*". The second name is, in each case, the name of the office, rather than of the person.

The third stage is that in which the name of the office is used alone, without the personal name. And just as we have "Christ" alone, so also we have "Peter" alone. Indeed, it seems clear that "Peter" became much more common than "Simon". The official name almost supplanted the personal name in the case of the disciple, while it would not be true to say this of the Master. At any rate it is significant that whereas the Gospels usually speak of "Jesus" instead of "Christ", the personal name thus retaining its ascendancy, the disciple is usually referred to as "Peter" rather than "Simon". It would seem that, by the time the Gospels were written, the name of the office had practically become the name of the person holding it. Thus, the Gospels constantly state that "Peter" did this, or said that. At the Transfiguration, Our Lord takes with him "Peter and James and John". It is "Peter's" mother-in-law who was sick of the fever. "Peter" and James and John accompany Our Lord to the Garden of Gethsemane. And yet it is noteworthy that the Evangelists seem to go out of their way to record Our Lord's own use of his disciple's *personal* name. And thus we get statements like that in Mark xiv, 37: "He saith to *Peter*: '*Simon*, sleepest thou?'"

In one instance we have all three forms of the name: "Jesus saith to *Simon Peter*, '*Simon*, son of John . . .' *Peter* was grieved" (John xxi, 15 et seq.) Note that the form used by Our Lord Himself is "Simon".

We now come to the one occasion on which Our Lord addresses his disciple as "Peter" instead of as "Simon". This occurs in St. Luke's Gospel. Our Lord promises St. Peter that his faith should not fail, and tells him to confirm his brethren. In doing so He calls his disciple "Simon". But immediately St. Peter boasts that he is ready to follow Our Lord even to death. Whereupon Our Lord

says to him : "I say to thee, O Peter, the cock shall not crow this day till thou thrice deniest that thou knowest me" (Luke xxii, 34). Coming so soon after Our Lord's statement that "Simon" was to confirm or strengthen his brethren, it seems clear that the official name is being used here ironically. The case would thus be parallel to the use of "Christ" in the verse : "Prophecy unto us, O Christ, who is he that struck thee?" (Matthew xxvi, 68). In each case, it is the official name which is being used deliberately. The rock-man, who boasted so much in his own strength, was to be allowed to fail, in order to teach him that his real strength comes only from Our Lord.

It is also interesting to note that, whereas after the Resurrection, the eleven said that Our Lord had "appeared to Simon" (Luke xxiv, 34), the angel who appeared to the holy woman told them to inform the disciples "and Peter" that Our Lord had gone into Galilee (Mark xvi, 7). Is not the angel here using the official name, as Peter now has to fulfil his function as the Rock of the Church ?

From that time onwards, it would seem that "Peter" was used in preference to "Simon", and even to "Simon Peter". Is it not a striking fact that at Corinth there soon grew up, in addition to a "Paul" and an "Apollo" party, a "Cephas" party ? The head of the Apostolic College was already known as "the rock-man" to the converts of Corinth. Later on in the same Epistle, St. Paul records that Our Lord after His Resurrection "was seen by Cephas". In the Epistle to the Galatians, the Apostle of the Gentiles tells his converts that "after three years" he "went to Jerusalem to see Peter", adding that at Antioch he had had to withstand "Cephas" to the face. This use of the official name "Peter" or "Cephas" is all the more remarkable because during this time the Church had to fight against the evil

influence of "Simon the Magus". There were also others called "Simon", and distinguished in various ways. But the Prince of the Apostles became known by his official title of *Petros* or *Cephas*, the Rock-man. How important, then, must the office of "rock-man" have been in the Church, if the name of the office came to denote the person holding it !

An interesting sidelight on the naming of the Prince of the Apostles is to be found in Acts x. In verse 5, Cornelius is told to send to Joppe for "Simon, who is also called Peter" (*Σίμωνα ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος*), who was lodging with "Simon a tanner". Verse 18 tells us that the envoys had asked for "Simon's house", and then "asked if Simon, who was also called Peter" (*Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος*) was lodging there. Does this not seem to indicate that the Prince of the Apostles was still commonly known as Simon ? *Petros* was at that time an additional name, and presumably one used only by Christians.

E. C. MESSENGER.

THE "PROFESSIO FIDEI" MADE ON RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH

IT must be a not uncommon experience of priests whose work in a busy parish includes much instruction of Converts to meet with difficulties over the Profession of Faith which they make at their formal reception into the Church. There are things to be explained, which somehow have been overlooked in the course of the instructions; perhaps the word "oecumenical" is an unintelligible mouthful; perhaps, even, a certain repugnance is shown to some of the phrases in the Profession, a repugnance which may even be a serious obstacle to taking the final step.¹ Certainly the present writer has so often heard regrets at the wording of the *Professio Fidei* from those who are far better qualified to judge than he is, that the conviction has grown that the time may have come to open the question of some slight alterations being made, which would remove any unnecessary difficulties that there may be in it. The Church in the Mission field studies the language and habits of those among whom she is working, in order to frame her instructions and her vernacular prayers in a way that they will understand. Perhaps we, at home, tend to forget that a wording which is familiar enough to us may strike quite discordant associations in the minds of those about us, whose acquaintance with the Church's life has so far been entirely external, and who know nothing of her vocabulary.

The following notes do not pretend to be exhaustive. They represent a little research into the origin of the "Profession of Faith" as we know it today, in the hope that others may be able to supplement them and perhaps improve on the alterations which are

¹ Cf. Dr. Orchard's pages on the subject in his *From Faith to Faith*, pp. 178-189.

suggested in them. It would be of interest to know whether a change would be welcomed as widely as the present writer is inclined to think. The suggestion is not so bold as it may appear at first sight : only two years ago the Holy Office approved of such a revision for several dioceses in France, and there seems no reason for thinking that it would not grant a similar approval for England.¹

I. History

Before proposing any alterations, it is necessary to discover as accurately as possible what was the original form of this *Professio Fidei*. On 20 July, 1859, the Holy Office replied to a *dubium* submitted by the Bishop of Philadelphia on the profession of Faith and the absolution of heretics at their conversion. The reply takes the form of an *instructio* which deals first with the question of Baptism, and then with the method of making the "*abiuratio seu fidei professio*" and of giving the *absolutio a censuris*. Before the description of the ceremony comes the following note :

"Notandum vero abiurationem seu professionem fidei aliam esse ab ea quae habetur in Bulla Pii IV. Nam a Suprema S.C.S. Officii praescripta fuit illa, quae adnectitur, pro conversione haereticorum."²

Search for any previous decree which contained this *professio fidei* having failed, the text appended to

¹ Cf. *Cérémonies de l'Abjuration*, by l'Abbé Quénet, V.G. Paris 1936. The pamphlet contains also the formulae to be used by "Orientals" and "Russians" respectively. Even in England there may be occasion to use them instead of that drawn up for Protestants, etc., with which we are dealing here.

² The oldest printed text so far available here adds : ". . . haereticorum, eaque utatur Episcopus Orator, cum formula absolutionis, quae pariter adjungitur." (*Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis II Acta et Decreta*, Baltimore, 1868.) This sentence is omitted from the official "sources", to be mentioned immediately, and there is incorporated instead an obviously later direction providing for the case of one already validly baptized, who would like to have the supplementary rites of Baptism performed. It has seemed worth while to point out these alterations in order to show how difficult it is to be certain what was *really* written in 1859.

the said reply will have to suffice. This is regrettable, because variations occur in the *soi-disant* reproductions of the text of this *instructio*, and, as we shall see, we can be certain of at least one addition that has been made to it.

The main sources here used are (i) *Collectanea S.C. de Prop. Fide*, Rome 1893, no. 1689; (ii) *Id.* 2nd edition, Rome 1907, no. 1178; (iii) *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes*, Gasparri, Rome 1926, vol. IV, no. 953. The superiority of the text of this last is shown by the fact that, when the Councils are mentioned with special reference to Trent and Vatican, Gasparri has placed the latter in brackets, preceded by the words: "nunc additur etiam". If one had only the *Collectanea* to go by, one might be led into thinking that the Holy Office had the gift of prophecy, and had, in 1859, demanded adherence to a Council which only opened in 1869!¹

The text of the Profession is given in Italian, and the addition to which allusion has been made refers to the Pope who is called "successore di S. Pietro Principe degli Apostoli, e Vicario di Gesù Cristo *infallibile*". That the last word was *not* included in the original seems to follow from the following table, in which is indicated its presence or absence in the various texts:

Conc. Balt., II, 1868² : No.

Collectanea, 1893 : No. *Collectanea*, 1907 : Yes

Ordo admin. Sac.

(England, 1915 ed.)³ : No. *C.I.C. Fontes*, 1926 : Yes

¹ The addition is not likely to have been made *before* 1877 (cf. *Collect.* (1893) No. 1670; *Collect* (1907) No. 1464; *C.I.C. Fontes*, vol. VI, No. 4236).

² The modern editions of the *Priest's New Ritual*, issued in Baltimore, mention the Infallibility later, viz. where adherence to the Councils is affirmed (cf. editions of 1902, 1914, 1927, 1930, 1933, 1935). The addition of Vatican to Trent is made the occasion of mentioning it. This shows most clearly that "infallibile" was not in the 1859 original.

³ Cf. also *Form for the Reception of a Convert, C.T.S.* (earlier editions, from 1908(?), Bishop Hedley; 1934 revised edition, Dr. T. E. Bird).

Maynooth Synod, 1906 : No.

Irish Rituale, 1929 : No.

French

English

German

} texts 1934¹ : No. French text, 1936 : Yes

The fact that it is absent from the *Collectanea* of 1893, from the version in our *Ord. Admin. Sac.*, and especially from that of the Council of Baltimore of 1866, forces us to question the accuracy of Card. Gasparri's text in this instance, especially as there is a strong *a priori* probability that the Pope's Infallibility was not included in a Profession of Faith before its definition at the Vatican Council. But it is clear enough that our present version, along with other modern texts, is lagging behind the times lamentably, and that here, if anywhere, a change is demanded.

Actually one would like to know where the version for England came from. It is to be noticed that the older editions of the *Ordo administrandi Sacramenta* all have the Formula Tridentina even after 1859.² The only indication which the present writer has come across is that of the 1915 *Ordo* which informs us (p. 72) that the Instruction of the Holy Office of 1859 was given to the Bishops of England on 20 January, 1900. Some of the earlier editions by Bishop Hedley (perhaps all?) bear an Imprimatur dated 1908; one wonders whether it was not printed before that. But the historical problem remains: what is the precise relation of our text to that of 1859?

II. Suggested Changes

Besides the reference to the Pope's Infallibility (the grounds for the addition of which are dogmatic-

¹ Printed as *Addenda* (with the Imprimatur, 1933, of the V.G. of Tour-nai) to the latest edition of the *Rituale Romanum* published by Desclée. This edition carries, besides, a Supplement for England and the U.S.A. (Imprimatur 1934), where our *Professio Fidei* is printed out again with variations.

² Hence not only those of 1788, 1831, 1856, but also those of 1869 and 1891.

ally obvious), the other alterations bear almost exclusively on the happiness or unhappiness of the wording. Only the more important need discussion. The slighter changes can be left to speak for themselves in the complete text as set out below.

We are early pulled up by the following : speaking of the Church (or is it the Faith of the Church ?), the Neo-Convertus is expected to say :

"against which I grieve that I have greatly erred, inasmuch as having been born outside that Church I have held and believed doctrines opposed to her teaching".¹

To the uninitiated this can only mean that "I am guilty for having been born outside the Church and for all the unhappy consequences of it !" It is a word-for-word translation of the Italian, the simple meaning of which is that the Neo-Convertus has, whether guiltily or not, been seriously mistaken in his beliefs, due to the accident of his birth outside the true Faith, and that he now regrets having held those erroneous ideas.

The various other versions either are unsatisfactory or fail to reproduce the whole of the original. The French version (1933) turns the relative clause into a principal sentence, and cuts out the reference to birth outside the Church :

"je regrette d'avoir gravement erré contre cette foi, en admettant et croyant des doctrines contraires à son enseignement".

This makes clear that the object erred against is the Faith—as the Italian seems to require—and removes the irrationality found in our version, but at the same

¹ "... e sapendo che niuno può salvarsi fuori di quella Fede, che tiene, crede, predica, ed insegna la S. Cattolica, ed Apostolica Romana Chiesa, contro la quale mi dolgo di aver gravemente errato, perchè, nato fuori di essa Chiesa, ho avute e credute dottrine contrarie all'insegnamento della medesima."

time it removes what was intended to be an attenuating circumstance.

The new French version (1936) gives a quite acceptable sense, but it is not quite what the original says :

"... en dehors de laquelle je regrette profondément d'avoir erré, par la raison qu'étant né hors de son sein, j'ai reçu et cru des doctrines contraires à son enseignement".

Here the Church has become the antecedent, and the word *errato* is given its radical meaning of 'wandering'. The other changes are slight, but the sense as a whole has been altered.

Going back to the Baltimore version of 1868, we find the clause "having been born outside that Church" simply omitted, an omission which persists in the modern American *Ritual*.¹

It is omitted also from the text published in 1906 in the *Appendix ad Acta et Decreta* of the Synod of Maynooth (1900), pp. 30-31.

Finally the omission occurs again in the *Addenda* to the *Rituale Romanum* published by Desclée², though the passage reappears in the text found in the Supplement !

This persistent omission raises the question whether the phrase was in the original of 1859 at all. The many texts that have been consulted show a certain independence of one another, and it is more difficult to explain the omission than to suppose that an *addition* was introduced, say, in the *Collectanea* of 1893. If, however, explain we must, then it will be because the phrase fitted awkwardly, and we are therefore justified in attempting to revise it.

There is another cause of awkwardness which could easily be removed. In English we try to avoid

¹ Cf. the editions mentioned in a previous note.

² So too the German version in Desclée, besides the French version already quoted.

changes of construction which hold up the sense. Here, after beginning : "I, N.N., having before my eyes . . ." we introduce a relative clause "against which . . ." (which is itself qualified by "inasmuch as . . .")—before we come to what "I" am now doing : "I now, enlightened by the grace of God, profess . . ." It is as clumsy as the sentence which here tries to describe it ! But we can make it run more or less smoothly by introducing a second participle thus :

" . . . and deeply regretting that I have been opposed to that Faith, owing to my having lived outside the Church and so holding and believing doctrines contrary to what she teaches ;

"Now, enlightened by the grace of God, I profess my faith that . . ."

"Regret" is a word that can apply equally well to what one has done wilfully or not, and the same may be said of "being opposed to". "Owing to" seems to represent as well as may be the thought which underlies the disjointed Italian text ; and what primarily led to holding mistaken doctrines was "having lived outside the Church". One might indeed keep "having been born outside that Church", but that is exposed to the current quip that "no one is really a *born* Catholic". This version, then, avoids the inconsequence of the old one ; it will apply to the rare formal heretic as well as to the merely material heretic one normally has to deal with ; and it squares the carping critic.

Later on, belief is affirmed in "the authority of apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions". This again is a literal translation, and those of us who have grown up in the Faith see nothing to shy at in the phrase. But if we recall that we ourselves use the word "traditions" in widely differing senses, we must not be surprised if it is here "often taken to mean

'legends' ".¹ In fact no one will deny that there exist traditions which have no authority at all. To obviate all misapprehension, it would seem better to use the word "Tradition" (in the singular, with a capital T²) which, especially when coupled, as here, with Scripture, has a quite definite technical sense which must have been explained in the course of the Convert's instruction. It could be put in this way :

"I believe in the authority of Tradition, apostolic and ecclesiastical, and in that of the Holy Scriptures. . . ."

Passing now to the Scriptures themselves, our text, after speaking of their interpretation "in the sense which our holy Mother the Church has held and does hold", adds : "to whom alone it belongs to judge of their meaning and interpretation". This sentence, for all its orthodoxy, does not occur in the Italian text, as given in any of our three sources ; it does not occur in the Baltimore or Maynooth versions, nor in any of the American or Irish rituals consulted, but only : (1) in our *Ordo admin. Sac.* ; (2) in the *Form for the Reception of a Convert* ; and (3) in the French and English versions in the Desclée *Rituale*.³ (It has been once more omitted in the new French text of 1936.) One wonders what zealous hand introduced it.⁴

Last of all comes the most serious crux of all. The final paragraph of our version opens thus :

¹ *How to Instruct a Convert*, by A. Gits, S.J., p. 41. A little lower down he writes : "It seems desirable that there should be a simple form of words. The majority of converts have received only an elementary education." The possibility of such a simpler form need not be considered to lie outside "practical politics". The Plenary Council of Latin America, held in Rome in 1899, published such an abbreviated formula, in which, apart from general adherence to the Church and the abjuration of heresies, no specific dogmas are mentioned except those of the Primacy and of the Infallibility of the Pope. (*Appendix ad Concilium Plenarium Americae Latinae*, p. 763.)

² Our *Ordo admin. Sac.* and Desclée (1934) are the only texts with a small "t".

³ The German version in Desclée omits it.

⁴ It is taken out of a larger context from the Profession of Faith of Pius IV, the *Tridentina Professio*, (Denz. 995).

"With a sincere heart, therefore, and with unfeigned faith, I detest and abjure every error, heresy and sect opposed to the said Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church."¹

We have here the climax of the formula, which in reality is meant to be an *abiuratio haeresis* even more than a *professio fidei*.² Its object is the expression of a renunciation and abhorrence of everything that could lead the Convert away from the path of truth which he has found. But unfortunately the word "detest" in this context conveys to English ears much more than this. It suggests, when directed towards persons, and towards sects, that one has a positive loathing of them and wishes evil to befall them. Obviously such an attitude towards individuals is indefensible and is certainly not intended by the formula. One might even question its applicability to "heresies" and "sects" as such, for it reaches indirectly the individuals who belong to them, and in any case we are now learning to acknowledge that in most cases even the "heresies and sects" have, at their best, preserved enough of Christian truth to make them powerful allies against the secularism and atheism which are today threatening all Christianity indiscriminately. Lastly it suggests bad faith in all who are thus "detested", and passes over as negligible the sincerity which generally characterizes their devotion to Christ.³

For these reasons it seems advisable to avoid the word "detest". It is true that its meaning will normally have been explained during the instructions,

¹ "Quindi con cuor sincero, e fede non finta detesto, ed abiuro ogni errore, eresia, e setta contraria alla detta S. Cattolica, ed Apostolica Romana Chiesa."

² Cf. *Ordo admin. Sac.*, Tit. III, cap. IV, 2. Children under the canonical age do not make an *abiuratio* but only a *professio*. The historical precedent for this is the case of an English boy of ten who was thus received into the Church in 1613 (cf. *Collectanea* (1893) No. 1680, especially the note).

³ Incidentally it looks like a repudiation by the Convert of all his own former life, of his own earnest prayers and of all the graces by which, through following his conscience, he has been led into the Church,

and that the duty of charity to all will have been inculcated, as much as the need of avoiding anything that might endanger the Faith. But even so, the word is harsh-sounding, and in any case it is not accompanied by such explanations when the formula is read by the hostile critic or by the would-be Convert who has not yet followed a course of instruction.

It is to be noted that the passage has been altered in the new French version, which already has the approval of the Holy Office, and we might perhaps adopt the line suggested by it. It reads as follows :

"En conséquence, de tout cœur et avec une foi sincère, j'adhère à tout ce que propose la sainte Eglise catholique, apostolique et romaine, et je désavoue toutes les doctrines contraires, les schismes et les hérésies que l'Eglise a condamnés."

This does not imply any condemnation of persons, nor even a repudiation of anything good or true in the sects. Indeed, some may think it an excessive weakening of the original. But this is remedied by the fact that an explicit oath is added to the formula ["et je jure par serment . . ."], and provision is made for a solemn signature to the document, which requirements seem to be only a local arrangement.

The following phrasing is therefore suggested :

"Therefore, with all my heart and in loyal faith, I embrace all that the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church professes, and in God's presence I solemnly forsake and renounce every opposing doctrine, schism and heresy which the Church has condemned."

In this way the full solemnity of the *abiuratio* is preserved and the difficulties that surround the word "detest" are avoided.¹

¹ "Forsake and renounce" is Dr. Orchard's suggestion, *loc. cit.*, p. 189.

III. The Proposed New Version

In the following text no changes calling for special remark have been made other than those already mentioned.¹ One feature in its *form* has been borrowed from the new French version, viz. the repetition of "I believe" before each paragraph.² This renewal of the personal act of Faith seems really valuable, and prevents the "Profession" degenerating into a mere enumeration of the articles of Faith. The changes that have been made are not distinguished either by italics or by reference numbers, because such a process over-emphasizes what is simply part of one level whole, and anyone who is interested will have at hand our present formula with which to compare it.

I, N.N., kneeling before the Holy Gospels, which I touch with my hand, and recognizing that no one can be saved without that Faith which the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church holds, believes and teaches; and deeply regretting that I have been opposed to that Faith, owing to my having lived outside the Church and so holding and believing doctrines contrary to what she teaches;

Now, enlightened by the grace of God, I profess my faith that the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church is the one true Church established on earth by Jesus Christ, to which I submit myself with my whole heart. I firmly believe all the articles that she proposes to my belief; I reject and condemn all that she rejects and condemns, and I am ready to observe all that she commands me. And especially do I profess the following:

I believe in one only God in three divine Persons, distinct from and equal to each other—that is to say, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;

I believe the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation,

¹ Still it may be worth noting that "*General Councils*" instead of "*Oecumenical*" is read in all the English versions except that of our *Ordo admin. Sac.*, and of the 1934 Desclée.

² It is also found in the modern American *Rituals*.

Passion, Death, and Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ ; of the personal union of the two Natures, that is, of the divine Nature with the human ; of the divine Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, together with her spotless and perpetual Virginity and her Immaculate Conception ;

I believe that in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, Our Lord Jesus Christ is truly, really and substantially present, Body, Soul and Divinity ;

I believe in the seven Sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ for the salvation of mankind : that is to say, Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders and Matrimony ;

I believe in Purgatory, the resurrection of the dead, and everlasting life ;

I believe in the Primacy, not only of honour, but also of jurisdiction, of the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles and Vicar of Jesus Christ ; and also in his infallible teaching authority ;

I believe in the veneration of the Saints and of their images ;

I believe in the authority of Tradition, apostolic and ecclesiastical, and in that of the Holy Scriptures, which we must interpret and understand only conformably to the sense which has been and is given them by our holy Mother the Catholic Church ;

I also believe everything else that is taught and defined in the Sacred Canons and General Councils, especially in the Council of Trent and in the Vatican Council.

Therefore, with all my heart and in loyal faith, I embrace all that the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church professes, and in God's presence I solemnly forsake and renounce every opposing doctrine, schism and heresy which the Church has condemned.

So help me God and these Holy Gospels, which I touch with my hand.

The few departures in this version from the original wording of the text of 1859 may be justified not only by what has been said above, but also by the recommendations made to the recently established "Pia Unio Cleri pro Missionibus". The primary

aim of the "Missionary Union of the Clergy" is, of course, to encourage a practical interest in foreign missionary work, so that the whole Church may co-operate in the spread of Christ's Kingdom throughout the world. But as a corollary we read in Article 4 :

"Insuper studet ut acatholicorum omnium ad unitatem Ecclesiae reditus foveatur, cum unio omnium Christianorum conditio sit magni momenti ad ethnicorum conversionem obtinendam."

Hence among the methods which the "Pia Unio" adopts is the following :

6 i) "promovendo, actione sive privata sive communi, attentis locorum adjunctis, et prout zelus illuminatus suggererit, ea omnia quae dissidentes fratres ad unitatem fidei facilius allicere queant".

One cannot doubt that *removing obstacles* is included in this proposal, and the fact that local differences are allowed for would, one is led to think, justify even greater changes, were they necessary, than those proposed in these pages.¹

* * * * *

In a petition made to the Holy Office by one of the Bishops of Germany for an authentic interpretation of the phrase *post abiurationem iuridice factam*, the current practice was thus described :

"Idcirco abiuratio non tam actus iudicialis aut iuridicus, sed magis actus *pastoralis* officii censi debet, sed semper validus etiam pro exteriori foro."

The reply of the Holy Office, in determining what

¹ We have in the title "*Pia Unio Cleri pro Missionibus*" an illustration of the danger of a literal translation. It seems that we have been preserved from having to refer to this magnificent project as the "Pious Union of the Clergy for the Missions"! The use of the word *Pious* would be enough to kill all virile interest in it. Non-Catholics are not the only ones to jib at ill-chosen words. (However, cf. *The Ecclesiastical Review*, Jan. 1938, p. 52.)

was to be done, endorsed this idea in principle, and at least tacitly admitted among the reasons which the petitioner had put forward, the following consideration :

"Accedit quod valde consultum est ut haereticis conversis *modus abiurandi facilis et commodus reddatur.*"¹

M. BÉVENOT, S.J.

¹ *C.I.C. Fontes*, Vol. IV, No. 1237 (28 mart. 1900).

HOMILETICS

First Sunday in October, 2 October, 17th Sunday after Pentecost.

Not everyone that saith : Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom (Matt. vii, 21, 22 ; see Luke xiii, 25).

THE month of October is now glorified for us by the Feast of Christ the King ; and in these sermons we hope gradually to develop the idea of the nature of His Kingship, seeking to indicate at first that it is *not* an affair of force or even of external formality of behaviour ; yet that it is authoritative ; and that it implies, in reality, that whole "corpus" of doctrine concerned with the Mystical Body of Christ—that Body which in all its parts is perfectly animated by His Holy Spirit and controlled by His Power.

(1) Some time ago, a group of Baptists asked that "The Roman Catholic Point of View" might be explained to them. This was done in the hall attached to John Bunyan's old chapel, where his chair is still to be seen. Their comments were more than kindly ; the main objection was : "Your Faith seems *mechanical* compared with ours." (This was due to our use of Sacraments which an Anglican bishop so often describes as "*magic*".) Longer ago, a young Jew said to us : "The moment you Catholics begin to be interesting, you cheat. You fall back upon : 'The Church says . . . the Church commands.' You subside upon a cushion : we can lean only on a spur." Others have said : "It is tragic that when *we* are looking so desperately for a Faith, we so seldom find Catholics, especially educated ones, living according to their profession. They seem contented whereas we are not—and yet, their moral life is (so far as we can see) in no way better than ours." These were not men who took "pharisaic scandal" ; their moral life *was* good, and reasonable. Now it is easy to show that wherever free will is involved (as it is in the use of Sacraments), there can be no question of the merely "mechanical", simply because a machine has no free will. (Still less, of the "magical", because "magic" involves a mood in which the will is hostile to God.) But is it possible for us to have *a* dose of the mechanical in our religion,

and, even, to treat the Sacraments almost *as if* they worked "magically"? To treat the "forms" of our worship as though they were "empty"—an adjective always applied to them by any critic?

(2) Yes; if only because all good things have their proper danger attached to them. Explosives; arsenic; reading; the wireless. The anti-formalist, who cannot bear so much as the "form of sound words", i.e. a Creed, soon floats off into the vague, and ends by not being sure what he believes—if anything. The man who objects to a "fixed morality", and says that morals develop (or anyway change) according to circumstances, cannot really object if business-contracts are wriggled out of, or treaties torn up, or if his wife goes off with someone else. Even the pagan poet Sophocles knew there were "eternal laws on high": it was with these that earthly laws, or customs, must conform. On the other hand, it is *easier* to profess (as we all do) belief in the Trinity than to "scrutinize" that mystery: it is easier to "go to Mass" just because we are told to, than to make sure what is *meant* by Sacrifice, than to experience a need for offering it, a love for Mass due to its being what it *is*. This is a devitalized religion, if it is all we have: a sort of soul-paralysis, which needs a miracle for its cure.

(3) Still, minds exist which prefer something as material, as numerical as possible; they do not want to burrow into what is timeless and beyond space. Even the "devotion" to the Nine Fridays—not through lack of devotion to the Sacred Heart—can make us anxious in practice: because there are those who are more genuinely concerned with the "Fridays" and with the "Nine" than with the S. Heart. Not that we deprecate "numbers" as such. The Seven Hours of the Daily Office are as it were natural, ever since the "week" came to exist: Triduum are natural, ever since the Resurrection: yet how people have loved to invent devotions which involve 9, or 5, or 30—not really in the spirit of St. John's *Apocalypse*—let alone St. Augustine's desperate attempt to find a reason for saying that 38 was a number that rightly should symbolize sickness. Briefly, two Hail Mary's are not, in themselves, twice as good as one: the (very devout) nurse who did

not try to baptize a dying newborn child but pushed a medal under its mother's pillow and told us she had thought that that "would do as well" was wrong—not that we deprecate the use of medals . . . and the pursuit of "new devotions" often implies more interest in the novelty than in the devotion.

The upshot is that no Catholic "form" need be empty, but, being a form, it *risks* becoming "empty". We cannot say that Christ is fully King in a soul whose religious life is wholly, or chiefly, an affair of forms or formulas. We have then begun by describing an imaginable Catholic life which is as shrivelled and un-apostolic as possible. We hope to end with the opposite extreme—that life in which Christ is truly All in all.

The Guardian Angels are at least commemorated today. We pray that these pure spirits will help us to lead our "mixed" life in, so to say, a due proportion. We never shall be angels and are not meant to be : but we are meant to be in all things "led by" the Spirit—to be "Holy-Spirit men", full of God, alive with and by means of God.

Second Sunday in October, 9 October, 18th Sunday after Pentecost.

I command . . . yet not I, but the Lord (1 Cor. vii, 10).

(1) Last Sunday we spoke of those who regard the Church as imposing "empty forms" upon Catholics, and of those who give them excuse for so regarding her. Others do not go so far as that, but think that the system of authority prevailing within the Church certainly robs religious life of its due spontaneity and initiative, and injures men's personality. And indeed, we cannot possibly deny that the Church is authoritative ; and we agree that when Catholic controversy in England was mainly concerned with the Established Church, the governmental aspect of the True Church had to be constantly insisted on. Catholics were represented as those who were obedient to the Pope. And rightly, for that is true ; and it still is necessary because so many Anglicans say that they believe all that the Pope does, and are separated from Rome only

externally and by force of circumstances, and that they are, in fact, substantially united with him. To that we might reply by asking : To which of them would he give Holy Communion ? If he is right in refusing them, they are wrong : if they are right, then he is wrong, for Communion may not be refused to any Catholic who is not in a state of mortal sin. But more often will you find among non-Catholics the feeling that any external Authority hampers Christian liberty. St. Paul condemned those who said : "Taste not ; handle not" ; who attended to "new moons" and special feasts ; who "forbade to marry and commanded to abstain from meats". They see herein a reversion to the Pharisaic tithing of mint and cummin, and an overlaying of the Law of God by the enactments of mere men.

(2) We repeat : For good or ill, the Church is an authoritarian system ; and we must display that none the less this does not conflict with liberty. A German who not long ago visited England, began by finding us not only free but "free and easy" . . . the land seemed a very "untidy" one to him. Afterwards he began to appreciate what our "liberty" stood for. But it by no means meant mere opportunity to "take liberties" : and he said : "I doubt whether your younger generation understands what sacrifices its ancestors made, and that it ought to make, to deserve, obtain, and preserve Liberty." He meant that a free man is so, only in so far as he freely admits restrictions for the sake of his fellow-men. Christ told us to give to Caesar what belongs to him ; and to God, what belongs to God. But in each case, we have to *give*. History shows that the Church, precisely in so far as she insisted on this double authority, created and preserved true human freedom. We cannot give details of that : but we recall that before the Coming of Christ, society was established on the basis of Slavery, and a slave was not a proper human person at all. He was his master's chattel. But with the proclamation of the sacred character of every individual soul, this was no longer possible. All Canon Law, on which medieval Law was, as a matter of fact, based, started from the recognition of the immeasurable worth of each immortal soul, son of God, heir of eternal

life. Hence none could claim to possess, or to exploit, his fellow-man.

(3) But it belongs to the very nature of man to live "socially", i.e. in union with his fellow-men : now no society is conceivable unless it has within it an authority. Otherwise men would be living not even like herds, but like hordes. Hence, if a man so much as wishes to preserve his personal independence within Society, he must freely obey that Authority. This is how the Middle Ages struck out that perfect formula—*Liber et legalis homo*—the free and law-abiding man : free, *because* law-abiding. Hence you can observe two extremes—an Authority which exists for its own sake, and at the expense of the individual (be this the Government, or the head of a business-concern or even a parent in regard of his children)—it has then turned into a tyranny : and the Anarchist, who objects to any law at all, which is individualism run mad : in this country we can hardly imagine such an ideal existing ; but in Spain the Anarchists are a very strong party, and do represent, precisely, Spanish individualism (not at all a bad thing when mated with obedience to proper authority) divorced from all sense of authority, and, in fact, "run mad", because no longer properly human.

(4) This was written in a house on the Janiculum hill, and the writer could nightly contemplate the Pope's illuminated window in the Vatican opposite. In the circumstances just then existing, it did not seem strange that Englishmen were, in such great numbers, beginning to be interested in the Pope as never, perhaps, before. He is obviously unique among rulers. He *rules*, and cannot tolerate chaos, which they, too, detest. Nor can he employ physical force, such as can be observed in the two extremes of Government which now confront us, and which again are alien to the taste of Englishmen. Moreover, his rule reaches to mind and conscience, but does not do so in the name of any merely human theory about race, nationality, class, nor certainly for his personal advantage. The nature of his Authority is in direct consequence of the Catholic doctrine of God, the nature of the Soul, and the reinforcement of these by the Revelation of Jesus Christ, accredited Mouthpiece of God, and Teacher of the human race, and

Head of that "perfect society", the Church. Hence we may pray that no Catholic may ever injure, by his life, the Catholic ideal. He would do so by personal lawlessness or license, by "immorality" even of a private kind ; but even more if, by "exploiting" his fellow-man, on a scale small or large, he gave the lie to all that is most fundamental in our belief as to God and men alike.

Third Sunday in October, 16 October, 19th Sunday after Pentecost.

Be eager for the better gifts (I Cor. xii, 31).

(1) This meant that a Christian could lead an ordinary life, without any special "gifts" ; but that God was prepared to give special gifts, and that some of these were better than others. For example, the very curious "gift" of being able to speak in a language that neither your hearers, nor even yourself, could understand, was not so good as being able to "interpret" what you said—i.e. to express yourself properly in your own and your listeners' language. Indeed, if we study the whole of this chapter, we shall see what store the Apostle sets by gifts concerned with understanding, and with *teaching*, and in some way turn out to the profit of the entire *community*. If, then, we are habitually seeking to understand our Faith more and more deeply, and to hand on what we know by being able to speak about it sensibly, both to Catholics and to others, we shall be preparing ourselves to appreciate ever better that doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ of which we sometimes hear it said that it is "too high" for the minds of "average men", and so we omit it altogether. Indeed, we have more than once met people who, hearing nothing but "practical morality" preached in our churches, drift off into false and (to our mind) dreadfully vulgar mysticisms, such as Theosophy : yet after all, there are many minds that *need* something sublime and truly "mystical" for their nourishment ; and the only safe mysticism is the Catholic one ; so we *must* be "eager" to supply that "better" thing too.

(2) At the other extreme we are sometimes depressed

by the number of Catholics who dislike books or sermons that make them "think", or even, as we have once heard it said, that "make them uncomfortable". We seem to observe this phenomenon almost more often among the "educated" than among those who have had fewer privileges, and who seem often more eager to be helped to think than those who have been at wealthier Catholic schools. But to compensate for this, we notice an increasing number of young men and girls who, if Catholics, are inspired to do something definite for "Christ the King", but recognize quite clearly that to do this effectively they must be trained—and on what does the Holy Father insist more often or more strongly when speaking of Catholic Action than "formation"?; and to discuss matters with such young people is often, we find, a very good training for ourselves, for they will state their difficulties in their own way, and having heard non-Catholics discuss them, so that they know also what other people are thinking. It is, too, almost pathetic how many young non-Catholics do want to come and "talk things over" and are longing to find a basis for some kind of Faith which shall be more spiritual, more sublime, than the vague ideas or commonplace motives or even self-regarding morality proper to most unthinking men.

(3) "Who is sufficient for such things?" as St. Paul must constantly have asked himself! He had not only to teach others, but to express to *himself*, in words that he had to invent, what he knew by Revelation, which most certainly included that very doctrine of Christ's Mystical Body. He had to hammer out his own doctrine, and then to hand it on. And to whom? Not to the very learned or "refined" primarily; and indeed he succeeded best among the sturdy but very rough Galatian mountaineers, and the sensual friendly mercantile Corinthians; and less well in sophisticated Athens. So we can take heart of Grace! We may even enjoy ourselves . . . our minds thrive on exercise! A well-known writer and speaker recently said that he had found it positively delightful to argue with Communists and to try to get the whole talk down to words of one syllable. They were, said he, constantly accepting long words—"dialectical materialism",

even "ideology", without having thought out what they meant—not but what I imagine that there is more "intellectual appetite" among young Communists than among ourselves, and perhaps much more eagerness to hand on what they have learnt. Hence we recommend every kind of "study-circle", reading-club and so forth, and the not being afraid of a book because it is "hard"—drenching all this with that Prayer which alone will ensure our guidance by the Holy Spirit and the ever increasing life around us of Christ's Mystical Body.

Fourth Sunday in October, 23 October, 20th Sunday after Pentecost.

"In Christ" : St. Paul (162 times).

(1) It was impossible for the first Christian writers—and it is, indeed, for us, seeing that the notion was new and unique—to find an adequate comparison for our union with Christ and so with one another. Yet since we cannot permit the notion to elude us altogether, we are bound to try to cope with it somehow. St. Anselm says that the proper order, when Christian Mysteries are being attended to, is, first to believe them : but, when once our faith is solid, it seems to him sheer indolence if we do not apply our minds to understanding them so far as possible. (In *Cur Deus Homo* : I quote from memory, yet I think accurately.) We might first, then, use our Lord's own method, which was pictorial. St. John's favourite expression, "Eternal Life", goes deeper than a "picture" ; but is more elusive by far. "I am the Vine-stock ; you, the branches" (John xv) is more easily grasped as a metaphor than most : one sap circulates throughout : divine is the life, divine the fruit. The metaphor of Bread (suggested at once by the Holy Eucharist) was dear to St. Paul. "All you are one Bread"—many are the grains ; yet the loaf is one. Both St. Paul and St. John love the image of Temple and of City : neither columns nor stones are either Temple or City ; yet without them, the whole building would collapse : so, the Christian is in-built into Christ—into that Christ who in a true sense does not yet exist, nor has

He yet reached the full stature of His maturity, because not yet have all predestined souls been incorporated into Him. But that word "incorporation" carries us over to that of the Living Body, in which the limbs are different among themselves, yet the body is *one*. They are vitally and organically "in one" with one another and form the whole. We should nowadays probably use the term "cells" or "limbs", because the latter are so few; the former, innumerable. And certainly St. Paul lands himself in certain difficulties—the rest of the body does not *grow from* the head: but, as we said, no metaphor is exact; and anyhow the whole body is *one*, yet the head, the mind, does in a true sense control it; and St. Paul is insisting on the unity between Christ and Christian, and yet, the royalty, the supremacy of Our Lord within that unity. This finally leads us to the last comparison that may serve us—human marriage. St. Paul labours to explain the union between husband and wife—a union wherein none the less the man preserves a true "headship", and can find no better "parallel" or analogy than the union between Christ and His Church (Eph. v, 32). "The mystery here is great—but I speak in allusion to—in terms of—Christ and His Church." Indeed, in I Cor. vi, 15-17, he condemns impurity even outside of marriage in terms that may terrify many: the limbs we misuse are *Christ's* limbs: "he that is joined to the Lord *is one spirit*": the soul is prostituted; and for a while, at least, the divine wedlock exists no more. Impossible, I repeat, to provide a parallel to the Grace-Union between Christ and Christian, which shall be absolutely exact.

(2) In proportion as we stress the incorporation of Christian into Christ, so shall we wish to stress the co-corporation of Christians among themselves. Those who are vitally united with One, are vitally united among themselves. We are, says St. Paul, forming words to suit his thought, co-planted, co-crucified, co-buried, co-risen, co-heirs, and to be co-glorified with Christ. And therefore, with one another. This is an aspect of Holy Communion which we might emphasize more often. How can I "go to Holy Communion"—remain in Communion—with Christ, and yet (sometimes forthwith) put myself out of Com-

munion with one who has entered, perhaps at my very side, into that self-same Communion? To be simultaneously in Communion, and out of it, that sounds a contradiction in the very terms! To inflict wounds upon my neighbour is like driving a knife into the very limbs of the Child that Mary holds up to us. The wounds we inflict on our neighbour *are* inflicted upon Christ.

(3) But in the same way, every service we render to our neighbour is accepted by Christ as done to Himself, and so it is. "Inasmuch . . . to *Me* you did it: to *Me* you did it not." The more deeply we appreciate the doctrine of the Mystical Body of our Lord, the more intense will our mutual charity become: and the more intense it is, the more alive will be that very Body! Truths too precious and operative ever to be neglected.

*Fifth Sunday in October, 30 October, 21st Sunday after Pentecost,
Feast of Christ the King.*

*Peace I leave with you: My peace I give unto you: not as the
world giveth, give I (John xiv, 27).*

(1) This feast has for its epistle that part of the first chapter to the Ephesians which is almost identical with an earlier passage (Col. i, 12-20), and this makes it perfectly clear that the Church does not *intend* us to allow the Mystery of the Body of Christ—that Church which is "the fulfilling of Him who is fulfilling Himself in all things", so that Christ shall be All, and *in* all to—escape our attention. And thus is He to "stand forth" manifestly Head of the whole creation of God, and King.

(2) Today, the idea of "absolute kingship" is distasteful to very many, and so is that of arbitrary dictatorship. And in a true sense no one is absolute, paramount, save God. Every human power is subordinate to *Him*. No earthly Caesar can dictate to conscience. But that is very different from refusing to obey authority at all, and we fear that God and Christ are increasingly being disregarded as, precisely, *authoritative*. It has often been said that Englishmen believe in God, but as an absentee. That is

one result of that ferocious form of Protestantism which exhibited Him almost wholly as a vengeful God, as the all-seeing Judge, only too ready to condemn. The Name of God is now used either lightly, or to lend a touch of solemnity to a phrase or situation. Still less is Christ regarded as a final authority. Perhaps He is venerated as a "good man" who was gentle, went about "doing good", on the side of the down-trodden ; but impractical, as when He said : "Turn the other cheek"—almost the only sentence that is readily quoted from the gospels nowadays. And our fellow-countrymen's ignorance—no wonder !—of the sheer history of Christ has become appalling. Of course there are now those who, ever more loudly, declare that they "will not have this man to reign over us", and maintain that Christianity has done harm and must be got rid of. And we know how any display of authoritative-ness on the part of the Church is instantly decried as "obscurantist", a return to the middle ages ; a brutal imposition of "dogma" on the mind, and of a form of antiquated morals on behaviour.

(3) The Offertory Prayer for the second Sunday in October, prayed by the Church throughout the world, and by us in so far as we were in union with the celebrating Priest, spoke thus : "O God, who, through the mysterious exchange—transaction—due to this Sacrifice, dost cause us to share in the One Supreme Divinity, grant that even as we have knowledge of Thy Truth, so we may by worthy behaviour attain to it." Hence there certainly is a *truth* that as Catholics we ought to know ; and a fitting *behaviour* by which alone we can achieve what it reveals to us. We do not then disguise for a moment that the Church teaches and commands, in the Name of Christ, and in the very Name of God. But in what a perspective ! In that of the complete mystery of God's love, which was such that He took up our human nature, wedding it in the Incarnation to His divine Nature, in order that we might ourselves be made participators in "the One Supreme Divinity" ! And since there was Sin in the world, He did not refuse any of the results of that, but still willed His complete Self-offering to God, in our name, to be made, though during His life on earth that involved Calvary itself. *That* is what we

appropriate and offer at Mass, so that the life of Christ and Christian become united, and as St. Peter says, we form, all of us together, a "royal priesthood" (I Peter ii, 9). Hence, if we allow the notion of the supernatural Order, and the way in which we are admitted to it, to fade from our belief and worship, we shall become, quite simply, de-Catholicized, and fall into the same tragic state as the unbelieving world is. For, in proportion as the true notion of our Lord's Kingship weakens, so will every kind of false human authority assert itself, and we shall indeed be living in a world of tyrannies, and, as an inevitable consequence, of hates and war.

But if, full of love and gratitude for the marvellous revelation of God's own love (displaying itself in complete self-sacrifice) we gladly submit ourselves to that Kingship, and hasten the full Coming of that Kingdom, we shall not only be at peace within ourselves, but, owing to our "fitting" behaviour, we shall be co-operating in the extension of that Kingdom, and of Christ's peace, round about. No army, no scheme of finance, no diplomacy, no paper-programmes for betterment will bring that peace to pass. It depends on us. If there be but enough Christians living out *fully* their Christian lives, they cannot but prove such a leaven in the world, such a transforming influence, that the Rule of Satan would definitely be defeated. And even should we not live to see that, perhaps we may be called upon even to die for it: not for that should we lose our peace, but even in the hour of martyrdom the "Peace of God" would exult within our hearts.

C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY

IN these Notes three months ago we reviewed P. Garrigou-Lagrange's *Christian Perfection*. This masterpiece has been followed by an English translation of a slighter work of the great Dominican theologian. *The Three Ways of the Spiritual Life*¹ is a kind of outline of the essential theses of *Christian Perfection* and of its companion work, *L'amour de Dieu et la croix de Jésus*.

It deals with the three periods of the spiritual life, purgative, illuminative and unitive, and in particular with the three conversions by which the soul enters those states. The three periods correspond in the natural order, according to the division of St. Thomas, to childhood, adolescence and manhood, and are, in the view of P. Garrigou-Lagrange, as profoundly different from each other psychologically as are the three stages of natural growth. The first conversion is the wonderful transition from the state of sin to the state of grace. Like the other two conversions, it has its parallel in the life of the Apostles. The second conversion is the entry into spiritual adolescence, and is effected by the passive purgation, or night, of the senses. It corresponds to the conversion of the Apostles after the Passion when they began to understand the sublime meaning of that mystery. The soul, now in the illuminative way, begins to have infused contemplation. This is a cardinal point of P. Garrigou-Lagrange's teaching. It is, he insists, the Carmelite and Dominican view; against it is the view of Scaramelli and many Jesuits, who place the illuminative way before the entry into contemplation. The third conversion leads the soul into the perfection of the unitive way and of infused contemplation. It is effected by the passive purgation, or night, of the spirit. It is the work of the enlightening, strengthening, transforming Spirit who perfected the Apostles at Pentecost. Such is P. Garrigou-Lagrange's theory. He sustains it with ability and skill; and incorporates into it much fine analysis of the states of the soul under the guidance of St. Thomas, St. Catherine

¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. Pp. xii+112. 3s. 6d.

of Siena and St. John of the Cross. No one who wishes to penetrate the problems of contemplative prayer can afford to neglect the writings of P. Garrigou-Lagrange.

In marked contrast to this theoretical discussion of the three Ways is Archbishop Goodier's *Introduction to Ascetical and Mystical Theology*¹. His Grace means to be practical, and practical he is. His book contains the substance of seventeen lectures which he gave at Heythrop over a period of five years. He divides it into three parts. The first part is historical ; in it he gives a very rapid sketch of asceticism and mysticism outside the Church and within the Church in the time of the Fathers, in the earlier and later Middle Ages, and in Modern Times. In the second part, called "doctrinal", he treats of God and the Supernatural Life, of Christ the Source of the Spiritual Life, and of Man's Response, of Spiritual Perfection and the Means to it. The third part, the 'Ways', is mainly practical. His Grace describes the Purgative way, its prayer, and its characteristic note of purification by penance and mortification ; then the Illuminative way, affective prayer and the practice of the virtues ; and finally the Unitive way, contemplation and mysticism.

The book is not large, and it covers a very wide field. The text-book on which the lectures are based is Tanqueray's well-known *Ascétique et mystique* ; but the Archbishop does not follow that book except in its main plan. Actually, apart from the historical section, his lectures could more properly be described as conferences. What he has here written sums up in a way all that he has published on the things of the spirit. He himself sets out his general theme in the statement that "whatever be the difference of emphasis and practice, all religious orders, the priest and the layman, have all the same fundamental principles, definitions and ideals, of asceticism and mysticism, of mortification and prayer, of action and contemplation".

In the doctrinal section he says little about the nature and organism of grace ; he remits the reader to an appropriate dogmatic treatise. He says nothing about the gifts of the Holy Ghost, except to advise the reading of Dominican writers on the subject, presumably Gardeil and P.

¹ Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. Pp. x+209. 7s. 6d.

Garrigou-Lagrange. He brings out excellently that perfect love is perfect self-surrender. His Grace is undoubtedly at his best when he dwells on the love of God and on the appeal of the Man Christ Jesus. But he hardly does justice to affective love, as distinct from effective, when he says that it is "an encouragement, a preliminary in most cases (to effective), to feel the attraction of love". For affective love is love itself, the outpouring of the will ; effective love is valuable as a guarantee of the reality of affective love.

With regard to the "ways", he wisely points out that they are only general categories and are by no means mutually exclusive. "No two souls", he rightly says, "are alike, as no two faces are alike ; every man's spiritual life is a thing apart." It is a salutary protest against the over-systematization of the spiritual life which results from too much theorizing. The Archbishop intends before all else to be practical and in touch with reality. Mature wisdom is an outstanding feature of his book.

At the same time one is left wondering if the overriding of barriers and the refusal to give precise definitions and the attempt to portray souls as they are does not lead the distinguished author too far. Occasionally, for instance, he does not seem to give the supernatural its full value, as when he says : "Supernatural Prudence transcends natural Prudence, not so much in its operation as in the end it has in view." Again, he seems at times to make the only important contemplation to be that which is known as acquired. Thirdly, in one page he seems to class those who are gifted with infused contemplation among the dreamers of the world, absent-minded and tongue-tied ; which I submit is not quite consistent with his subsequent splendid tribute to the power of this contemplation in an Augustine, Catherine or Francis.

The November volume of the new, critical edition of Butler's *Lives of the Saints* is as excellent as its predecessors.¹ It is an interesting and varied volume. Among the well-known saints discussed are Sts. Andrew the Apostle, Charles Borromeo, Elizabeth of Hungary, Gertrude, John of the Cross. There are several notable English or British saints :

¹ By Herbert Thurston and Donald Attwater. Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 7s. 6d.

the two Edmunds, Hugh of Lincoln, Winifred, Hilda, and Willibrord, apostle of Frisia. Also there are B. Cuthbert Mayne, Protomartyr of the seminaries, and three famous Irish saints whose lives are well authenticated : Columban, Malachy and Laurence O'Toole. Important additions include Sts. Albert the Great, John Berchmans, Leonard of Port Maurice, and the Popes Siricius and Nicholas I. The legends of certain famous saints are briefly discussed in judicious footnotes by Fr. Thurston. The conclusion seems to be that we must regard St. Catherine of Alexandria as a merely imaginary person, and St. Cecilia as a saint without a known history.

Another extremely important and careful work of hagiography is *The Golden Book of Eastern Saints*, by Donald Attwater¹. Over twenty lives of saints are narrated, ranging from St. Basil the Great, Father of the Church and Founder of eastern monasticism, to holy souls who have lived in our own days. The book is intended as a pendant to Mr. Attwater's recent book on the history and present state of the Catholic churches of the eastern rite. The lives are meant to exemplify the character of eastern holiness and thus to show its divergence from, and yet likeness to, western sanctity. Saints are chosen, therefore, as typical of a class ; there is the earlier monk, and the later monk, the apostle, and the "royal" saint. It is a book not merely for those who are interested in the return of the East to unity, to whom it is indispensable, but for all who would understand the full implications of Catholicism, who realize that there is a western mind and an eastern mind, and that the Catholic Faith is adapted to both.

In *The Cross and the Crisis*² Mgr. Fulton Sheen strikes out on a new line of apologetic, or, rather, returns to the very oldest apologetic of all, that of St. Paul himself, who knew nothing but Christ and Him crucified. He offers as the only remedy for the economic ills of our day a re-discovery of the Cross, "which is at once the measure of the world's sin and the pledge of its redemption". To develop his thesis the author applies the parable of the

¹ Science and Culture Series. Bruce, Milwaukee & Coldwell, London. Pp. xx+166. 26 illustrations. 9s. 6d.

² Bruce, Milwaukee & Coldwell, London. Pp. xii+219. 8s. 6d.

Prodigal Son to the history of civilization since the sixteenth century. Following the Protestant revolt, with its denial of authority and traditional beliefs, there has developed a complete loss of God and of spiritual values. But men are beginning to be painfully aware of the emptiness of the things that they have chosen; there is nostalgia for their Father's home. But as yet this nostalgia is often an undiagnosed malady. They must then enter into themselves and return to their Father's house, to the full acceptance of God. Spiritual regeneration is thus the theme of the book. "In this day of intense loyalties, the sleek repose of Christians who will not sacrifice themselves for the things of God cannot meet the new challenge. It will take a great faith in Christ to put down faith in anti-Christ; it will take nothing less than the sacrifice of the Cross to conquer the sacrifice of those who crucify." Mgr. Sheen's book makes a noble and powerful plea for this revival.

*Heart to Heart*¹ is a prayer book compiled by Fr. D. M. O'Connell, S.J., from the writings of Cardinal Newman. Very many of the Cardinal's most beautiful thoughts and prayers are included. *English Prayers and Treatise on the Holy Eucharist by St. Thomas More*, which Mgr. Hallett has edited, speaks for itself.² It is a little book of surpassing charm and beauty. *Breviary of Piety for Clerics*³ is an old book under a new name. It is the fourth, revised and much enlarged, edition of the All Hallows Manual, and contains the prayers and hymns generally used by clerical students and priests, spiritual conferences and meditations. Everyone will profit much by its use.

J. CARTMELL.

II. SOCIOLOGY AND ECONOMICS

Last year in November a very successful Catholic Social Week was held in Belfast. This city happens to be at once the most highly industrialized in Ireland, and the most strongly Protestant and Orange, with the possible exception of Portadown. As a consequence it breeds a most

¹ America Press. \$2.

² Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 2s.

³ Browne & Nolan. 4s.

pugnacious and energetic type of Catholic, radical and integral in his Catholic outlook and uncompromising in his attitude. The papers read at that Catholic Social Week have been published in a small booklet by the C.T.S.I., under the title *Towards Social Justice*. It is an excellent shilling's worth, as some of our best Catholic speakers are represented in its pages. It is a pity that lack of money should have made it impossible to bring out such valuable matter in a better format. I hope readers will not be put off by the smallness of the print, or the signs of rather hasty editing. Despite the *Nihil Obstat*, which appears on the fly-leaf, I personally should not like to commit myself to all the judgements (for instance, that on page 27) contained in the various papers here printed. But substantially they are well worth study.

A number of books have reached me from Allen and Unwin dealing with the Social Question from the Protestant point of view. Perhaps the most important of these is *The Kingdom of God and History*, one of the volumes of *The Church, Community and State* series. As will be remembered, this series sprang from the World Conference held at Oxford in July 1937. The publishers claim that "the leading theological scholars and churchmen of every nation" have contributed to this attempt at "a clarification of the major issues confronting men, especially Christians, in the world today". It should be clearly understood, and it is clearly admitted in the Introduction to this volume, that the Catholic Church has taken no official part either in the Conference itself or in the preparation of the series of volumes. There has been a certain amount of "unofficial help of some of its thinkers and scholars". Undoubtedly these volumes serve a most useful purpose in enabling those whose professional duty it is, to keep abreast of the best thought of sincere religious men on vital questions. But they are not books that can be unreservedly recommended to the ordinary lay Catholic nor such as even the ordinary priest would find useful. The philosophical presuppositions of most of the writers are not those of the Catholic Church and consequently many of the arguments and conclusions are by no means acceptable to Catholics.

Naturally, a Catholic will be interested in Christopher

Dawson's contribution to the present volume. It is a typical Dawson product : suggestive, ingenious, slightly vague and academic, with wide and sweeping horizons in time and space and thought. Again and again, a sentence contains a most illuminating and fecund criticism of history. "Thus in comparison with the optimism of liberalism the Christian view of life and the Christian interpretation of history are profoundly tragic. . . . [The Church] has been the guest and the exile, the mistress and the martyr, of nations and civilizations and has survived them all. And in every age and among every people it is her mission to carry on the work of Divine restoration and regeneration, which is the true end of history." It is greatly to be desired that some of Mr. Dawson's learning and outlook should find its way into both the programmes and the teaching of history at Catholic schools.

The Christian Challenge to Christians (Allen & Unwin, 6s. net), by Kenneth Ingram, is a book which will hardly interest Catholics. Mr. Ingram seems to believe in some form of evolution where religion is concerned : a gradual modification and adaptation of dogma and principle to the gradually changing social conditions. The Church of Christ, or the religion of Christ, Christianity, is not immutable, is not One, Holy, and Apostolic, but is many and modern. It is remarkable what an attraction an old heresy like modernism can exercise over such evidently sincere men as Mr. Ingram and his fellows. "Roman Catholicism", he writes (p. 110), "is essentially the religious expression of the feudal type of civilization. . . . It is important to remember that Catholic feudalism was indeed the Christian expression of that particular economic stage. . . . One honours it (the Catholic Church) as one honours the relics of ancient Egypt ; one marvels at its ability to resist the ravages of time. The mind of Rome and the power of Rome are not indications of the living power of religion. There is power, but it is the power of a death which to a remarkable degree is able to resist the process of decomposition."

This patronizing, condescending type of nonsense enables one to evaluate Mr. Ingram's qualifications of knowledge and judgement fairly accurately. His whole book, while containing useful *obiter dicta* on many page,

displays an astounding ignorance or blindness to objective facts, a mind completely dominated by the idea of historic evolution, and a most unsound judgement. He admits the actual miracle of the Catholic Church's continued existence when, according to him, it ought to be decomposing ; and yet seems unable to draw the only sound conclusion from that miracle.

The Unitarian Contribution to Social Progress in England, by Raymond V. Holt, is another Allen & Unwin book (10s. 6d.). It is a painstaking, conscientious piece of historical research on a limited subject, but somewhat heavy and dull in execution. We are told that "the book aims at bringing out the characteristic spirit or ethos of Unitarians by showing how their faith has found expression in social life and thought". Now that would be an interesting and important contribution to sociology. But, in my opinion, the book does not achieve this professed aim. We are told, in anything but an orderly and systematic way, a great deal about the social thought and social activities and ideals of a number of distinguished men and women. But what we are not shown is how this thought and these activities were in any way connected with the specific religious opinions and principles of Unitarianism. In other words, I, at least, have failed to discover a Unitarian social philosophy in the sense in which we speak of a Catholic social philosophy. None of the achievements chronicled in this volume seems to owe its inspiration or execution to any specifically Unitarian belief. It is a little difficult to see how the denial of eternal punishment, of vicarious atonement, or of the "infallibility" of Scripture, gave the Unitarians a great opportunity for being leaders in social reform.

The most useful of this group of non-Catholic books, which I have received, is undoubtedly *The Church and the World*,¹ by C. E. Hudson and M. B. Reckitt. It describes itself as "a companion to the historical study of Christian Sociology", and it certainly is an excellent companion and guide in a very arid and confusing territory. The present volume deals with *The Ancient World*, including the Jewish ideas on human society, the Early Church, etc., and *Christendom*, that is, the medieval period up to Aquinas

¹ Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.

and Dante. A second volume is promised, which will complete the picture up to the present century. This is a book we can recommend to all seriously interested in social matters. It is, of course, well to remember that neither Canon Hudson nor Mr. Reckitt is a Catholic; but their objectivity and historical conscience have made this a book which Catholics will find most useful in many ways. Such things as Property in Medieval Theory, the Just Price, the Restraint of Usury, are well dealt with from the historical point of view. "Our essential purpose," write the authors, "is to bring together material from the works of the greatest students of, and experts upon, the matters which we treat, in such a way as to bring out the truth about the past, and at the same time to indicate the problems which the consideration of that truth raises for those who are giving attention to the sociological issues of the contemporary situation." Authorities such as Professor George O'Brien, Dawson, Fr. D'Arcy, are allowed to speak in their own words, while many foremost non-Catholic writers, such as Carlyle, Tawney, Toynbee, are also utilized.

A reprint of the Report of Section III of the Conference on Church, Community and State, Oxford, 1937—a conference I have already mentioned above—has also been sent to me. It is entitled *The Church and the Economic Order*.¹ Among the very many useful points which it contains, one paragraph especially impressed me. It is a re-statement of an important doctrine contained in *Quadragesimo Anno*—the doctrine of responsibility—especially the responsibility attaching to private property and economic power. But the whole pamphlet is well worth reading, despite its very naturally prudent and cautious tone and its avoidance of detailed solutions.

A little batch of French books has come my way: *Sous le Joug Hitlerien*²; *L'Extrémisme Catholique*³; *Catholicisme et Communisme*⁴, by P. Rambaud, O.P.; and *Trois Leçons sur le Travail*⁵, by Yves Simon. The last two are distinctly books to recommend. M. Simon's acute philosophical analysis of human labour is particularly

¹ Allen & Unwin. 6d. net.

² La Bonne Presse.

³ Bruxelles: La Cité Chrétienne. 2.25 frs.

⁴ Ané Avignon. 8.80 frs.

⁵ Paris: Tequi.

valuable and very actual. It forms a splendid introduction to *A Philosophy of Work*¹, by Etienne Borne and François Henry which has just been published. In 1922 Haessle published the first serious study on this subject—a book, by the way, not translated yet into English, though M. Etienne Borne has published a French version. A special number of *Esprit* was devoted to the same theme in 1932 or 1933. Manuel Rocha's study, *Travail et Salaire* followed, and now we have this latest work. It is a most suggestive treatment of a vital problem in sociology: a problem, moreover, that is intricate and puzzling in the highest degree. "By work man at the same time discovers and conquers his dignity. But work is not the whole man. All our efforts must strive to put him in his just rank and place. If we consider the idea of work as an absolute and final end, we have no respect for nature and the moral finalities of the activity of work. The attitude which we are going to present in a rapid sketch is opposed with equal vigour to a pagan philosophy of contemplation, to the socialist idea of work and to the Jansenist pessimism which Christians sometimes take for the purest doctrine of the Gospels." There is a fine examination of the mentality behind "stakhanovism", impartial, cool, acute, but ruthless. "Russian Marxism will dry up the springs of the best of human energies and will expose its gigantic constructions to the worst possible catastrophes, if it understands too late that there can be no real humanism outside a reconciliation between the vocation of labour and the religious vocation of man [and provided that he does not hand over his ikons to Stakhanov]." (I have put this last clause in brackets because, although I have not the French original before me, I suspect that Mr. Francis Jackson, the translator, has nodded here in a sleepy fashion: possibly one of those French negatives, hated by and hateful to the less logical Anglo-Saxon mind, has tripped him up.) The book ends on a high and original note of hope. "Our protest of hope is also an avowal of hope in the workers. The virtues which are in their nature, spontaneous generosity and sincerity in friendship, may become the very soul and essence of the society of tomorrow, a soul which shall be

¹ Sheed & Ward. 6s.

naturally Christian. In the necessary and inevitable transformation of the spirit of gain to the spirit of service, the working class virtues can be the instrument of that Grace which builds up the justice of cities as it builds up the holiness of hearts. The world of the workers has suffered very deeply and intensely from capitalism, and suffering does not merely merit redemption, it also opens the eyes of those who suffer. . . . In this manner, under the shadow of anonymity and the obscurity of the miseries of history is elaborated an understanding of the course of history. The worker has this understanding because he has suffered."

Mr. J. A. Hobson's *Confessions of an Economic Heretic*¹ is an altogether delightful and a highly useful book. Hobson's name will always be associated with that "heresy" which is becoming orthodoxy very rapidly—the theory of over-saving or under-consumption. It is a doctrine found constantly in Catholic social philosophy, with which J. A. Hobson has much in common. He wants to see "quantitative standards of individual and social welfare which would bring it [economics] into organic relation with politics and ethics", substituted for a purely monetary and profit economy—a *Gewinnwirtschaft*. In *Quadragesimo Anno*, Pius XI more than hints that too large a proportion of the annually produced wealth goes either to form new capital goods or (what is often ultimately the same thing), to pay for capital goods already produced years before on credit or to make up for the depreciation of capital goods. What is wanted is a slowing up of production of capital goods, a slowing up of this frantic race to produce new unneeded (if not unwanted, that is artificially wanted) goods, and a larger consumption of those simple necessities which Nature gives us so abundantly—and which, at present, we waste or destroy. Catholic sociologists have long found J. A. Hobson a most useful, if unconscious, ally, and this latest book of his will find them still grateful.

A last word, but a most sincere one: Buy Sheed's *Communism and Man*², if only to see how an artist can handle such a subject. I hope to give a fuller account of this remarkable book in a future number.

E. J. COYNE, S.J.

¹ Allen & Unwin. 5s.

² Sheed & Ward. 5s.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

PARVITAS MATERIAE (DE VIO).

REFERRING to the answer given on page 72 of the July issue :

(i) Who were the theologians who held the view that there is *parvitas materiae* in venereal delectation directly willed ?

(ii) What are the arguments, briefly, in defence of this view ?

(iii) How came the opinion to be discarded ? (A. B.)

REPLY.

(i) We quoted Laarakkers, since he is concerned with defending the view, now almost universally abandoned, that there is *parvitas materiae* in certain circumstances, whereas most of the modern writers who mention the point at all are more concerned with refuting it. Laarakkers, on page 72, enumerates St. Antoninus, Caramuel, Diana, Martinus de Magistris, Javillus, Ledesma, Soto, Navarrus, Armilla, Corduba, Ariaga, Salas, Moija. The list is compiled from the *Salmanticenses*, from Viva on the *Condemned Proposition of Alexander VII*, n. 40, and from Sanchez *De Matrimonio*.

(ii) His arguments are, firstly, that it is not proved from Holy Scripture that the sin is grave *ex toto genere suo* ; nor, secondly, can this be established by theological reasoning ; nor, thirdly, from authority whether divine or ecclesiastical. The crux here is the condemned proposition : "Est opinio probabilis quae dicit esse tantum veniale osculum habitum ob delectationem carnalem et sensibilem, quae ex osculo oritur, secluso periculo consensus ulterioris et pollutionis."¹ The proposition, it is maintained, was not condemned for doctrinal reasons, but rather because of the evil consequences which would follow in practice. Lastly, there is no constant tradition in favour of the stricter doctrine. Any attempt to elaborate these points would take us far beyond the limits permitted in answering questions in this column. Laarakkers

¹ Denzinger n. 1140.

observes, with truth, that the argument against *parvitas materiae*, namely, that if delectation of a venial character is permitted it would lead on inevitably to grave matter, applies equally to the sin of theft.

(iii) Most authors date the beginnings of what is now the common doctrine to the prohibition in 1612 by Claudius Aquaviva, the General of the Society of Jesus, which directly affected Jesuit theologians, who were forbidden to teach as probable, or even as tolerable, the opinion that venereal delectation directly sought admitted smallness of matter. Owing to the authority and pre-eminence of the theologians of the Society, the teaching became common amongst all the moralists, as Noldin states: "Ex illo tempore, haec sententia, non esse parvitatem materiae in delectatione venerea directe quaesita, inter moralistas facta est communissima."¹ A careful and conservative theologian, such as Waffalaert—who adheres to the common doctrine—points out: "Haec itaque opinio, quam nos non sumus amplexi, an sit tolerabilis necne, an improbabilis dicenda, potius iudicio ac definitioni Ecclesiae, ut decet, relinquimus."² The more liberal opinion has never been expressly condemned by the Church nor has it been positively rejected as improbable. Moreover, the exact signification of Aquaviva's prohibition was later interpreted by the Jesuit revisors, in the sense that a Jesuit theologian was not forbidden to absolve an instructed penitent who accused himself of venial sin against the sixth commandment because of smallness of matter.³

E. J. M.

SIXES AT BENEDICTION.

Is it of obligation to have the six large candles lighted during Benediction on Sundays? (S.)

REPLY.

Following the rule in §6 of the Clementine Instruction for the Forty Hours Exposition, the law requires at least twenty wax candles for solemn Benediction; S.C.R.

¹ *De Sexto Praecepto*, 1936, p. 13.

² *De Virtutibus Cardinalibus*, p. 303.

³ Laarakkers, *op. cit.*, p. 73; Waffalaert, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

8 February, 1879 (n. 3480) permits the number to be reduced to twelve for poor churches. There is no *explicit* rule that the six large candles must be included in this number, but it is implied in the Clementine rule that the candles are to burn continually, that is to say, the practice of lighting only a few of the candles prepared on the altar is not correct. Applying this rule for the Forty Hours to a short Benediction, we think that the correct practice is to light the sixes, whether on Sunday or on a week day, in order that the appearance of parsimony may be avoided. It is more correct to have the sixes and fourteen smaller candles lighted rather than a greater number of small candles without the sixes.¹

E. J. M.

EUCCHARISTIC FAST.

(1) There are some people who remain in a permanent state of weakness after an illness. For how long can they continue to exercise the privilege of Can. 858?

(2) What of the *first* month. A person may be ill without being in danger of death. Must such a one, because unable to fast, be deprived of Holy Communion during the first month? There is often a difficulty in hospitals where medicine is ordered, say, every two hours.

(3) There are others who suffer permanently from some internal disorder which makes the fast impossible. Is their case covered by Can. 858? The case I have in mind is that of a man, apparently healthy and strong, who on account of an internal trouble has to have a drink in the middle of the night. He sometimes manages with great pain to make his monthly Communion, but more often than not he has to miss. (A. C.)

REPLY.

Canon 858, §2: "Infirmi tamen qui iam a mense decumbunt sine certa spe ut cito convalescant, de prudenti

¹ Cf. O'Connell, *The Clementine Instruction*, p. 5.
Vol. xv.

confessarii consilio sanctissimam Eucharistiam sumere possunt semel aut bis in hebdomada, etsi aliquam medicinam vel aliquid per modum potus antea sumpserint." The terms of this principle are such that almost every word affords some consideration of a casuistical kind. A confessor's approval is essential before the privilege may be used, and he will rightly give a benign interpretation of the law, since it is in favour of sick and suffering people: *favores sunt ampliandi*. Before dealing with these questions, we may first observe that A.C. appears to take it for granted that the privilege may be used only by those sick people *whose illness makes it impossible for them to fast*. Actually the law does not make this a condition, since a decision on such a question would, no doubt, be a cause of scrupulosity both for the sick person and for the confessor. A person who is otherwise qualified may use the privilege, even though they are able to fast: "Concessio non requirit ut praedicti infirmi in ea conditione sint, ut ieiunium naturale servare non possint. Unde tales possent etiam quotidie communicare: his scilicet non ieiuni; ieiuni vero reliquis diebus."¹ All agree, nevertheless, that it is desirable, out of reverence to the Holy Eucharist, to observe the fast, if it is possible, even though the law permits the taking of food. The outlook is rather the same as the counsel given to the faithful to fast before midnight Mass.

(*ad 1*) The law does not require the illness to be grave. "Grave" as distinct from "extreme" illness (in periculo mortis) is mentioned, for example, in Canon 523, in reference to the confessions of nuns. Usually the kind of illness which causes a person to be laid up, *decumbens*, confined to the room if not actually in bed, is serious or grave. But it may happen that it is not grave, from a medical point of view, and yet necessitates being "on the sick list"; if the other conditions are present, we agree with Cappello,² that the privilege may be used; there is no need to require gravity in the illness (which, after all, is rather relative and difficult to determine), since the law says nothing about it.

¹ Iorio, *Compendium*, Vol. II, n. 338. The same author, who is Cardinal Prefect S.C. de Sacram., taught a stricter doctrine in *La Communion des Malades*, n. 63.

² *Periodica*, XXIV, 1935, p. 22.

The law itself describes the condition of the sick person as one in which there is no certain hope that health will be quickly restored, "sine certa spe ut cito convalescant". The common interpretation defines *cito* as three or four days. *Convalescant* does not quite mean the same as convalescence, a stage in which the symptoms of disease have disappeared though the patient may still be enfeebled and unable to perform the ordinary duties of life; it means the regaining of health, and the privilege may be used as long as the person is still regarded as being laid up; enfeeblement after an illness is itself a species of sickness like old age. This point is further determined in the answer to the third question.

(*ad 2*) It is absolutely certain that this privilege of the common law cannot be used until a person has been ill for a month. There has been some discussion as to the computation of the month, and an unofficial reply of the *Codex Commission* decided that it was not necessary to compute it mathematically, i.e. according to the strict legal rules of Canons 31 *seq.*¹

(*ad 3*) The cases of people who suffer from some disorder which makes the fast impossible are not included under this Canon, unless the disorder reduces them to the condition described above, *ad 1*. On the data given by A.C. the case appears not to be included. The notion of being confined to the house, lying ill, is consistent with the interpretation given in the July CLERGY REVIEW, p. 75, namely, that ability to reach a church does not deprive a person of his privilege. But it is not consistent with the condition of a person who, though suffering, is able to go about his ordinary duties. The only remedy for such, and for a sick person before a month's illness is completed, is to seek a personal indult.

E. J. M.

THE LAST BLESSING.

According to the manualists, it would seem that Extreme Unction may be repeated during the same illness provided the person has been convalescent and again had a relapse,

¹ 24 Nov., 1927; *Periodica*, XXIII, 1934, p. 234.

whereas the Last Blessing may be given only once during the same illness. On the other hand, Canon Dunford, in his book, *Suggestions for the Newly-Ordained* (p. 66), seems to suggest that the Last Blessing may be given as often as the Anointings are repeated. His words are : "There is no need to give the Last Blessing, unless you have to anoint again." (R. C.)

REPLY.

S. C. *Indulg.*, 20 June, 1836, ad 7 : "Licetne, aut saltem convenitne iterum applicare indulgentiam in articulo mortis, (i) quando aegrotus accepit applicationem in statu peccati mortalis ? (ii) quando post applicationem in peccatum relapsus est ? (iii) quando post applicationem diuturna laborat aegritudine, uno verbo, quando Rituale permittit aut praecipit iterationem Extremae Unctionis, aut confessarius iudicat iterandam esse absolutionem ? Resp. ad (i) and (ii) *Negative* ; ad (iii) prout iacet, *Negative pariter in omnibus*."¹

Idem, 24 Sept., 1838, ad 2 : "Utrum Benedictio Apostolica pluries impetiri possit infirmis, novo mortis periculo redeunte ? Resp. *Negative*, eadem permanente infirmitate etsi diuturna ; *Affirmative*, si infirmus convalescerit, ac deinde quacunque de causa in novum mortis periculum redeat."²

The later reply makes more precise the answer given to the first. The formation of some rule about repeating Extreme Unction is a well-known practical difficulty, and the various views were fully discussed in this journal by Fr. Barry, 1933, Vol. V, page 193. The principle is in Canon 940, §2 : "In eadem infirmitate hoc sacramentum iterari non potest, nisi infirmus post susceptam unctionem covaluerit et in aliud vitae discrimen inciderit." Canon 468 contains no similar rule with regard to the Apostolic Blessing, but it should be noted that the same word "convalescerit" is used both in Canon 940 (Extreme Unction repetition) and in the reply of 24 Sept., 1838 (Apostolic

¹ Gasparri, *Fontes*, Vol. VII, n. 5005.

² *Ibid.* n. 5008.

Blessing repetition). It is, therefore, easy to understand, especially having regard to the conflicting opinions recorded in Fr. Barry's article, that Fr. Dunford formulated a simple and general practical rule, namely, that the Blessing should be given whenever the Sacrament is given (p. 65) and repeated when the Sacrament is repeated (p. 67).

But it cannot be said that the two sets of conditions are necessarily and always coincident. They coincide in the case where the sick person has recovered and fallen again into danger. But other situations which justify repeating Extreme Unction are dealt with by the manualists, in addition to the "convaluerit" of Canon 940, e.g. the time element in a prolonged illness, which may often be considered as indicating, morally speaking, that the person has ceased to be in danger of death or that a fresh danger has intervened, though it is apparent to everyone that the sick person had by no means recovered. Extreme Unction is then repeated, since a new danger justifies repetition and the sick person should not be deprived of that sacramental grace. But a sick person is not deprived of anything by non-repetition of the Apostolic Blessing, since the indulgence is not gained until the actual moment of death. The manualists, therefore, usually differentiate between the two things, and teach, with greater accuracy than Fr. Dunford, that we cannot act on the principle that the Apostolic Blessing is to be repeated whenever Extreme Unction is repeated. Like every other indulgence the conditions attaching to it are largely a matter of positive law, and the Church has directed that it is not to be repeated except in the case where the sick person has recovered and fallen again into danger of death.

E. J. M.

RECEPTION OF A CONVERT.

When did the law requiring the presence of two witnesses at a convert's reception come into force? If this formality is not observed what is the status of the convert?

(C.)

REPLY.

As explained in this Review, 1933, Vol. V, p. 319, the rite of reconciling heretics is largely based on the supposition that they are being absolved from censure in the external forum, at least *ad cautelam* and for the due observance of the liturgical rite. A rejection or abjuration of previous heresy is a necessary part of the procedure. It is an act of a public nature and therefore subject to the law of the Church, but the exact formality to be observed has varied at different times; what has always remained constant is the legal requirement of some proof that the abjuration of heresy has taken place. The Pontifical contains an *Ordo ad Reconciliandum* which supposes that the bishop is reconciling the convert personally, and it is because of this native power of the episcopate that Canon 2314, §2, declares that the excommunication attached to heresy may be removed by any bishop in the external forum. The bishop may delegate this power of his to some other priest, as is commonly done when a priest receives the faculty to reconcile a convert.

The common law now requires the presence of two witnesses at this act of abjuration. Previous regulations may be seen in Ojetti *Synopsis* s.v. *abiuratio* and *haeresis*. An Instruction of 8 April, 1786, required it to be "coram paucis". A reply of the Holy Office was given to a German Bishop, 28 March, 1900, who had pleaded a local custom of abjuration before the priest alone. It reasserted the law requiring witnesses: "Mens est quod abiuratio fieri potest coram quopiam ab Episcopo delegato ut notario, et aliquibus personis uti testibus."¹ Our *Ordo Administrandi Sacramenta*, tit. iii, cap. 4, n. 5, states: "Tam abiuratio haeresis quam neo-conversorum Baptismus conditionatus . . . semper fieri debent coram Notario vel Sacerdote ab Episcopo delegato nec non duobus saltem testibus." The chapter opens with a reference to an Instruction of the Holy Office, 20 June, 1859—an error of date for 20 July of that year.² This instruction does not determine the juridical form of

¹ Gasparri, *Fontes*, Vol. IV, n. 1237.

² Gasparri, *ibid.* n. 953. *Eng. Tr.* in Guy, *Synods in English*, p. 262.

the abjuration, but a further Instruction for the English Bishops, 20 January, 1900, is mentioned in the *Ordo*. We cannot trace the text of this document but, according to Dunn, it is to the effect that when the presence of witnesses cannot be secured without real difficulty, it is left to the discretion of the Bishops in England to dispense from the common law and practice, provided that the abjuration takes place *in foro externo*, and that it can afterwards be proved.¹ Accordingly, rubric 5 in the *Ordo* continues: "nisi in casu particulari propter verum incommodum Episcopus ab hac lege recedere permittat". A declaration of the Holy Office, 19 February, 1916,² states the law in almost exactly the same terms as are now found in Canon 2314, § 2: "Abiuratio vero habetur iuridice peracta cum fit coram ipso Ordinario vel eius delegato et saltem duobus testibus."

(ii) Unless, therefore, the Bishop dispenses the common law, the abjuration must take place in the presence of two witnesses. If, through negligence, this formality is not observed, there is fault on the priest's part, but the convert's status as a reconciled person is not affected, in our view. There is nothing in the wording of the law which argues that witnesses are necessary for the *validity* of the act. If we suppose, for the sake of argument, that the defect renders the absolution of the external forum invalid, the person at least receives absolution in the internal forum when he goes to confession, which will normally be immediately after the external forum absolution. This sacramental absolution is valid from Canon 2247, §3, since the censure is not one of those reserved to the Holy See *specialissimo modo*; and from Canon 2251, a person absolved in the internal forum may consider himself absolved *ceteris paribus* also in the external forum.

E. J. M.

VENIAL SIN.

Why is it that the definition of venial sin in Gasparri's Catechism takes no account of an act which falls short of being a mortal sin owing to insufficient knowledge or consent? (W. S.)

¹ *The Ritual Explained*, p. 34.

² Gasparri, *Fontes*, *ibid.* n. 1299.

REPLY.

The definition is : "Peccatum veniale est legis Dei transgressio scienter et libere commissa cum conscientia levis obligationis."¹ The note to Q. 566 (*Catechism for Adults*) explains the effect of an erroneous conscience in determining the existence of a venial sin : "si peccatum ratione materiae mortale committatur cum conscientia (erronea) levis obligationis, peccatum erit veniale". But there is no explicit statement of the doctrine concerning an act which is venial owing to insufficient knowledge or consent. It is, however, contained *implicitly* in the definition of a mortal sin : "Peccatum mortale est legis transgressio scienter et libere commissa cum conscientia gravis obligationis."² The implication is that a sin is not mortal unless committed knowingly and freely. Admittedly, a more positive explanation of this doctrine might have been given in this place, if the author so desired. But we cannot expect a catechism to be a treatise of moral theology. Many points must be left to the catechist for fuller explanation.

E. J. M.

FREEDOM TO MARRY.

What is meant by "status liber" in relation to the preliminary investigation of marriages? Does the law require the formality of a certificate or document declaring the freedom of the parties before marriage may lawfully be contracted? (B. M.)

REPLY.

Canon 1019, §1 : "Antequam matrimonium celebretur, constare debet nihil eius validae ac licitae celebrationi obsistere."

Canon 1020, §1 : "Parochus loci cui ius est assistendi matrimonio, opportuno antea tempore diligenter investiget num matrimonio contrahendo aliquid obstet."

¹ Q. 229 and Q. 566, Editio 3a, Rome, 1930.

² Q. 227 and Q. 564.

Canon 1097, §1, 1: "Parochus autem vel loci Ordinararius matrimonio licite assistunt, constituto sibi legitime de libero statu contrahentium ad normam iuris."

Freedom to marry in the strict sense refers to what is required in the parties that they may validly and lawfully marry. Apart from local diocesan regulations which may exist (the law presumes that there will be some in Canon 1020, §3) and apart from special circumstances to be mentioned below under (ii), the common law does not require freedom to marry to be attested by any formal document as such.

(i) The documents or certificates or formalities which the law does require will be found to include or imply that the parties are free to marry. There is, in the first place, *testimonium baptismi* required by Canon 1021, §1: "Nisi baptismus collatus fuerit in ipso suo territorio, parochus exigit baptismi testimonium. . . ." This is a grave law, and its obligation was reaffirmed by the *Congregation of the Sacraments*, 4 July, 1921. The surest testimony of baptism is an extract from the register signed by the parish priest, and local law often requires this. In addition to proof of baptism, it contributes to the proof of freedom to marry since, from Canons 470, §2, 1103, §2, and 1988, the facts of marriage, orders, religious profession and nullity decree are to be entered in the baptismal register; in the event of a marriage subsequent to these entries, the relevant facts will be recorded on the baptismal certificate. To be effective as a precaution against an invalid or unlawful marriage, the certificate must be of recent issue, and local legislation may determine this point more explicitly; cf. for example, *Liverpool Synod*, XXII, 1934, n. 148: "Ne admittatur baptismi testimonium ad partem liberam probandam, si ante tres menses scriptum fuerit." Secondly, the observance of the law regarding the *publication of banns* offers a contributory proof of freedom to marry. It is not necessary to record here the details of this law, contained in Canons 1022-1030, except to notice that its observance may sometimes require a certificate from a parish priest other than that of the parish in which the marriage is taking place: Canon 1029, "Si alius parochus investigationem aut publicationes peregerit, de harum exitu statim

per authenticum documentum certiore reddat parochum qui matrimonio assistere debet." Canon 1023, §2, leaves it to the Ordinary to determine the proof of freedom required in the case of parties who, for six months after reaching the age of puberty, have lived in places other than those in which the common law requires the banns to be published; he may require the banns to be published in all these places of six months' residence, or he may order other proofs to be obtained, including affidavits from the parties concerned.¹ We conclude, therefore, that a priest who observes the common and local law concerning baptismal certificates and banns, and who examines and instructs the parties according to Canons 1019-1034, does not require any further certificate of freedom to marry, except in special circumstances.

(ii) Special cases calling for some document or other arise, for example, when the possibility of some impediment is suspected, and the doubt has to be removed by consulting the Ordinary,² or when proof of the grant of a dispensation is required. If a marriage has been previously attempted, no matter how certain its invalidity may appear to be, a declaration of nullity and consequently of freedom to marry must first be obtained from the Ordinary.³ In cases of widows and widowers, the death certificate of a former spouse is the obvious proof of freedom. Except in cases of necessity, a priest may not assist at the marriage of a *vagus*, one who has nowhere a domicile or quasi-domicile, until the matter has been referred to the Ordinary.⁴ Even though they may not be technically *vagi*, emigrants from foreign countries are to be treated as such, according to the Instruction of 4 July, 1921, which forbids priests to assist at their marriages, except in cases of necessity, before previously consulting the Ordinary. This is also the rule of *I Westminster Council*, Dec. xxii, n. 7. E. J. M.

CERTIFICATE OF BAPTISM.

Canon 1021, §1, and the commentators thereon require a certificate of baptism from the non-Catholic party in a

¹ Cf. *Codex Commission*, June 3, 1918; *Liverpool Synod*, n. 149; Canon 1028, §1.

² Canon 1031.

³ Cf. Canon 1990.

⁴ Canon 1032.

mixed marriage. Why is this direction never observed in this country? (J. E.)

REPLY.

Canon 1021, §1: "Nisi baptismus collatus fuerit in ipso suo territorio, parochus exigit baptismi testimonium ab utraque parte, vel a parte tantum catholica, si agatur de matrimonio contrahendo cum dispensatione ab impedimento disparitatis cultus."

(i) Most of the commentators understand by *testimonium*, in this canon, an authentic extract from the baptismal register, signed by the parish priest. This supplies an undoubted proof of baptism and, in addition, offers a proof of freedom to marry on other counts, since the law requires the facts of marriage, holy orders and nullity decree to be entered in the register. The writers usually deal with the baptismal proof under the general heading of proof of *freedom to marry*, and a copy of the actual entry is an obvious means of assurance. Moreover, many local laws explicitly require a copy of the extract to be produced at marriage, and Canon 1020, §3, assumes that the Ordinary will make certain rules in respect to this previous investigation of marriages by the parish priest.¹

(ii) Others, with greater accuracy, do not require this official extract precisely as a proof of baptism, though it is required on other counts as a proof of freedom to marry, e.g. De Smet: "non requiri extractum baptismale ad verbum exhibens actum in registro insertum, nisi id in jure particulari exigatur; dicitur enim tantum: baptismi testimonium."² The proof of baptism is in Canon 779: "Ad collatum baptismum comprobandum, si nemini fiat praeiudicium, satis est unus testis omni exceptione maior, vel ipsius baptizati iusiurandum, si ipse in adulta aetate baptismum receperit." On this interpretation, the proof of baptism of the non-Catholic could often be got without applying to a non-Catholic church for the certificate. As a matter of fact, a dispensation from *mixed religion* usually contains one from *difference of worship* "ad cautelam", but the priest is obliged by the common law to get whatever

¹ E.g. *Liverpool Synod*, XXII, 1934, n. 148; Nottingham, *Decreta*, 1924, p. 24.

² *De Matrimonio*, § 678.

evidence of baptism is possible in the case of the non-Catholic party. Cf. *Westminster Synod*, XLV, 1925, page 12: "In asking for dispensations in 'Matrimoniiis mixtae religionis', evidence of baptism must be diligently sought." It is quite certain, therefore, that "*testimonium baptismi*" is required of the non-Catholic. Canon 1021, §1, excepts only the case of an unbaptized non-Catholic, and this exception would be quite meaningless unless it is to be understood, by implication, that the baptized non-Catholic is not excepted from the law. Gasparri notes¹ that this implication is sufficiently clear from the terms of Canon 1020, §1. Prümmer quotes an instruction of the Holy Office to this effect, dated 25 May, 1897,² but we cannot trace the document; it is not in Gasparri's *Fontes*.

(iii) The only remaining *dubium*, therefore, is whether a priest should obtain what is, after all, the surest testimony of the non-Catholic's baptism, by requiring an extract from the register. The commentators who understand *testimonium* in the sense explained above under (i) draw the natural conclusion that he should.³ We are of the opinion that he should not, at least in this country, since there is a contrary custom against it which has the force of law, according to Canon 5. Claeys-Bouaert provides for this exception,⁴ and Nau states explicitly that the baptismal record of the non-Catholic is not to be sought in the case of a mixed marriage.⁵

E. J. M.

MASS OR HOLY COMMUNION?

Owing to his business and the hour of Mass in the church, a parishioner of mine finds that on weekdays he can either hear Mass or receive Holy Communion, but it is impossible to do both. He asks which of these is preferable, and has received contradictory answers from priests consulted. (H. C.)

REPLY.

There are many considerations, relative to the person's circumstances, which might assist in coming to a decision.

¹ *De Matrimonio*, n. 144.

² *Theol. Moralis*, III, § 723.

³ e.g. Chelodi, *De Matrimonio*, § 21; Cappello, *De Matrimonio*, § 149.

⁴ *Manuale Iuris*, Vol. II, § 229.

⁵ *Marriage Laws of the Code*, p. 41; cf. also Acker, *Ne Temere*, p. 45.

For example, he may, perhaps, assist at Mass with greater devotion or *vice versa* ; or he may have a personal preference for one rather than the other ; or he may desire to gain an indulgence or do the Nine Fridays. Obviously he is at liberty to please himself.

But such considerations do not really touch the question, if we suppose that these circumstances do not affect the case, and that he is simply desirous of doing the better of two good actions. It is a quandary which could not have arisen in an earlier age when it was not the custom, except in the case of the sick, to communicate apart from Mass. But in these days, *pace* the liturgical purists, it is permitted, and it is the desire of the Church that the faithful should communicate daily. Certainly, it can be shown that Pius X had in mind Daily Communion during daily Mass, and Canon 863 urges all who assist at Mass not to be content with spiritual communion but to communicate sacramentally. But we cannot find any express solution of the point raised, apart from a short discussion in *l'Ami du Clergé*, 1912, p. 361, which actually leaves the difficulty unsolved. No doubt some of our readers could produce arguments or writers in favour of one rather than the other.

Our own opinion is that Holy Communion is preferable, firstly, because It brings grace to the recipient *ex opere operato* ; secondly, because the most excellent way of participating in the sacrifice is to partake of It. The Host is consecrated through a sacrifice and we participate in the Sacrifice by Holy Communion, a point which should never be forgotten even when Holy Communion is received at a time when Mass is not said.

On the other hand, it could be pointed out that the Church commands weekly assistance at Mass but Holy Communion only once a year, which would appear to argue that assisting at Mass, without receiving Holy Communion, is more important than receiving Holy Communion without assisting at Mass. Probably the best practical advice to give, though it does not solve the point raised, is that the person should hear Mass and receive Holy Communion on alternate days.

E. J. M.

SALE OF A CHALICE.

An executor of a deceased priest finds it necessary to sell the priest's chalice. Is this permitted and, if so, will the chalice need to be consecrated again after the sale? (V.)

REPLY.

(i) It is permitted, without any suspicion of simony, to sell a consecrated chalice for its intrinsic value as a precious or artistic object. There would be simony if a price above this intrinsic value is obtained precisely because of the quality of consecration. The example of a chalice, in this connection, is expressly mentioned in Canon 730: "*Non habetur simonia . . . cum datur res temporalis pro re temporali, quae tanquam subiectum habeat adnexum aliquid spirituale, ex.gr. calix consecratus, dummodo pretium non augeatur propter adnexam rem spiritualem*". Since it is a sacred object the vendor is not permitted to sell it to such persons as would put it to a profane use.

(ii) From Canon 1305 §1 a consecrated object, such as a chalice, loses its consecration by being broken or changed in such wise that it cannot be applied to its proper use;¹ by being used for a purpose unbecoming its character, for example, as an ordinary drinking vessel; lastly, by being put up for sale publicly. The qualification of publicity in the sale of a consecrated object is clearly necessary to cause the loss of its consecration. Canon 924 §2, dealing with indulgenced objects, declares that the indulgence is lost when the article is sold—without any qualification of publicity, but, in our view, this rule cannot be applied analogously to other sacred objects. The executor will, therefore, act in a perfectly legitimate manner if he sells the chalice privately to some other priest; it remains a consecrated chalice.

E. J. M.

¹ Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, 1937, Vol. XIII, p. 189.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

S.C.S. Offic., 17 June, 1938, "De speciali devotione erga sacrum caput D.N. Jesu Christi non introducenda". (A.A.S., XXX, 1938, p. 226.)

Quaesitum est ab hac Suprema Sacra Congregatione Sancti Officii an specialis devotio erga Sacrum Caput D. N. Iesu Christi introduci possit.

In Plenario Conventu habito Feria IV, die 15 Iunii 1938, Eñi ac Revñi DD. Cardinales, rebus fidei ac morum tutandis praepositi, re mature perpensa et praehabito RR. DD. Consultorum voto, attento quoque Decreto diei 26 Maii 1937 "De novis devotionis formis non introducendis", decreverunt specialem devotionem erga Sacrum Caput Domini Nostri Iesu Christi non esse introducendam.

Et sequenti Feria V, die 16 eiusdem mensis et anni, Ssm̃us D. N. Pius Divina Providentia Pp. XI, in solita audientia Exc̃mo ac Reṽmo D. Adessori Sancti Officii concessa, hanc Eñorum Patrum resolutionem Sibi relatam approbare et confirmare dignatus est, et publici iuris fieri iussit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Officii, die 18 Iunii 1938.

R. Pantanetti, *Supr. S. Congr. S. Officii Notarius*.

See CLERGY REVIEW, 1937, Vol. XIII, p. 315, for the text of the decree against new forms of devotion being introduced ; also, July 1938, p. 1, an article by Fr. Leeming, S.J., on devotion to parts of the Sacred Humanity of Christ. The devotion in question was beginning to flourish, no doubt, in various parts of the world. In this country it is associated with the name of Teresa Higginson, who believed herself to be specially commissioned to spread devotion to the Sacred Head as Seat of Divine Wisdom. "La chose nous paraît singulière," wrote Fr. de la Taille in 1927, "mais plus singulière encore, ou en tout cas plus suspecte, est la menace fréquemment répétée des maux et des châtements qu'encourront ceux qui tenteraient de faire obstacle à cette devotion."

E. J. M.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

ALTAR FURNITURE

4. *Canopy*

THE architectural structure of the altar, which the Church intends to be presented to the eyes, is not complete without some form of canopy. It is, in fact, the feature which most conspicuously provides the altar with the necessary architectural prominence, and causes it to be the focal point of all the lines of the building. Its form is capable of varied treatment, but its essential purpose is a single one—to cover the whole of the altar top, and the foot-pace upon which the celebrating priest stands.

The purpose arose from the Church's desire, at her earliest beginning, to endow with some symbol of majesty the altar "representing Christ Himself", who is our Altar, Victim, and Priest"; and it is for this reason that the canopy is no true example at all, unless it covers not only the representation of Christ's Altarhood, but also the representative of His Priesthood.

Its origin may be derived from the canopy covering the seat in the pagan basilica, in which sat the magistrate representing the basileus. When the Christians first used the basilican design for their own requirements, they adopted also the canopy over the magistrate's seat in the apse, and employed it as a symbol of majesty above the altar.

As early as the first half of the fourth century a magnificent canopy, adorned with figures modelled in silver, was given by Constantine to the church of St. John Lateran, of which a description is recorded in the *Liber Pontificalis*; and from that date till now the canopy on columns, or ivory, has never ceased to be used in Rome. Sometimes the canopy, instead of being a ivory on columns, is suspended from the roof or wall in the form of a tester or baldaquin. Examples of these survive from the fourteenth century onwards, but are relatively rarer than the ivory, since their structure is of a less permanent character. In addition to this continued practice, there are the prescrip-

tions in the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum* ordering its provision, and the replies of the Congregation of Sacred Rites defining its use.

The *Caeremoniale*, lib. i, cap. XII, §13, orders a canopy to be suspended over any altars attached to a wall, "square in shape, covering the altar and its foot-pace". The same is prescribed for an altar standing free of the wall, "unless it already have some canopy on columns constructed of stone or marble". The S.C.R. further defined their use in two replies to questions. That of 27 April, 1697, answers the question "Whether a baldaquin must be erected above all altars, either of a cathedral, or of other churches, or only on the high altar on which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved?" The reply is "On all." The second decree is in answer to a question of 23 May, 1846, "Whether a baldaquin must definitely be placed above every altar on which the Most Holy Sacrament is reserved?" To which the answer is "Let the decree of 27 April, 1697, be kept." Owing to the general neglect of these two decrees commentators consider that the strict observance of them may now be limited to placing canopies over at least all high altars and those on which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved. But the expression of the original picture in the mind of the church is significant, and indicates the architectural effect which she intends to create.

During the Catholic centuries in England the altar canopy was in constant use, evidence of which is more frequent than is generally realized. In Saxon times it took the Byzantine form of a dome pierced by four arches on columns. An illumination of one occurs in the Benedictional made for St. Ethelwold when bishop of Winchester from 963 to 984. As the east window became more and more developed in the middle ages, the columns were omitted and the canopy was raised up above the east window in the form of a tester. Only two of these remain in their original position, one at Clun above the high altar, the other at Ludlow over the altar of Our Lady. Both are in Shropshire.

Sometimes these medieval testers preserved the four columns of the ivory from which they derived; but the columns were left on the pavement round the altar in the

Vol. xv. 8

form of ridel posts, and no longer supported the canopy. They even retained, in the form of ridels, the curtains which were originally hung on rods between the columns of the civory. These curtain rods may be seen today on the civories in S. Clemente, Rome, dating from 1118, and St. Paul Outside the Walls, 1285.

Although curtains are no longer prescribed for civories, there is much to be said for retaining them, and some recent revivals of their use have proved effective. But whatever the form, the architectural importance of a canopy cannot be over-estimated. Its presence immediately establishes the altar as the one dominating feature of any church, proclaiming that the church was built for the altar, not the altar for the church.

GEOFFREY WEBB.

BOOK REVIEWS

Insurrection versus Resurrection. By Maisie Ward. (Sheed & Ward. Pp. xi + 588. 15s.)

ALTHOUGH, according to the Foreword, this is a separate book and not merely a second volume continuing into the twentieth century the record so brilliantly begun in *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition*, it is a necessary sequel to that volume, chronicling as it does Wilfrid Ward's political associations, his later literary work, the story of his last days, and Josephine Ward's support of him in all his trials, and her own contribution to the Catholic resurrection down to her death in 1932.

The title of the new book suggests that Miss Ward is now setting out to be an historian rather than a mere biographer; that her first objective is to tell the difficult story of the appearance of a fuller Catholic intellectual life after the period of "the siege". This necessitates a study of Modernism which represented a deviation from the true evolutionary path of Catholic scholarship, and which was the occasion of a necessary authoritative reaction deemed by Wilfrid Ward to be restrictive of progress. Nothing was nearer to Wilfrid's heart than the establishment of this intellectual Catholicism which, confronting the naturalist and materialist scholarship of our day, should be competent to defend dogmatic religion and to advance the truth along the new lines of scientific research.

Leo XIII had directed the minds of Catholic scholars to a revival of Thomistic teaching, and for Wilfrid and his friends that meant not merely the study of the text of the Angelic Doctor but also the revival of his spirit of bold speculation and confidence in the survival-value of truth wherever found.

Unfortunately for the realization of these hopes some of the most distinguished of Catholic scholars, inflated by the new discoveries especially in the region of Biblical Criticism, made shipwreck of the faith. Pius X recognized the destructive influence of Modernism which, like a noxious weed grown up in the night, was threatening ruin to the whole harvest of Catholic scholarship, if not to dogmatic religion

itself. Seminaries and universities were infected, and the strongest measures were called for and executed.

In England the Bishops had been alive to the dangers of Liberal Catholicism in the opening years of the new century and had issued a *Joint Pastoral* which, as far as we can judge from these pages, had received a cold welcome from many Catholics whose faith was beyond question but whose awareness of danger was not equal to that of their pastors. "Where are these Liberal Catholics?" wrote Dr. Schobel to Wilfrid Ward. . . . "The pastoral has misled the whole world as to a contemporary fact of history." But it was Dr. Schobel and his like who were in the dark.

Wilfrid Ward thought that the Pastoral had had the effect of driving Fr. Tyrrell to the extreme left. Be that as it may, it was not long before Tyrrell emerged as a leader of the Modernist heresy. Wilfrid Ward was shy of him. He feared that Tyrrell was trying to father his advanced opinions on the beloved Newman. With the Abbé Bremond's *The Mystery of Newman* he was openly exasperated: it was "a very impertinent book".

It must be remembered that from Wilfrid's boyhood Newman was his great hero; but there was an additional reason for his resentment of the Modernist attempt to involve the Cardinal. During this most trying period he was preparing his Newman biography. Any false step on his part, any successful implication of Newman's orthodoxy on theirs would have imperilled the labour of years. Great enough already were his difficulties with the literary executors, who not only questioned his interpretations, but demanded suppression of certain parts of the private journal as too intimate for publication. However, when the book finally appeared in January 1912 it was an immediate and triumphant success. I have a vivid recollection of the eager reading of *The Times* leader while resting on a mountain path in Switzerland and the joy of receiving as a gift a few days later a copy I could not then afford to buy. Whatever the claims of Wilfrid Ward on the grateful regard of his fellow Catholics outstanding amongst them must always be his perpetuation of the memory of the greatest English Catholic of the nineteenth century.

Although never tainted by Modernism himself Wilfrid

Ward had been very intimate with leading Modernists. He had been unaware of their disruptive tendencies and had looked to them for that reflowering of the theological spirit for which he yearned. When he recognized their disloyalty he broke off relations with them, and he himself received *Pascendi* with wholehearted obedience. Yet the Encyclical was to his mind full of difficulties which caused him the gravest anxiety. Foremost among them was the apparent condemnation of some of Newman's most characteristic teaching. At first he could not see how it was possible to dissociate the Cardinal from the general censure and rebut the gleeful claim of the Modernists that Newman and they were in the same boat. One theologian after another explained the difficulty away, but it was only when Fr. John Norris wrote to *The Times* to give an authoritative assurance that Newman was not involved that he could again breathe freely. He frankly disliked the severity of the régime and thought that it was going to do grave injury to Catholic scholarship. His biographer explains his miscalculation on that score. But he also felt that the failure to publish such commentary on the document as would have taken the sting out of it for loyal but ill-informed believers was imperilling souls both of inquiring outsiders and of thoughtful Catholics. That of course was none of his business, at least after he had once delivered his conscience in the matter. It was over this that he came into conflict with that other ardent Newmanite, Bishop O'Dwyer of Limerick, and left himself and the *Dublin* open to suspicion of disloyalty.

In this crisis Archbishop Bourne stood by him very faithfully. The two men were never very intimate. Temperamentally they were as unlike as possible. But more than once, when Wilfrid was in difficulties, the late Cardinal proved a very staunch friend and supporter. There are only occasional references to the Cardinal in these pages but such as they are they make him stand out clearly as a great figure, generous, loyal, imperturbable.

I am not at all sure that Wilfrid Ward's own attempts to explain the Encyclical, as they are revealed in his private correspondence, are sound. He never seems to have grasped the reality of the authoritative character of the Pope's

teaching as separated from the exercise of infallibility; thus, "The text of an Encyclical taken by itself claims obedience, but not mental conformity."

The Wilfrid Wards enjoyed throughout their lives the intimacy of many of the outstanding literary and political characters of their day, and these pages are brightened by the letters which passed between them and their friends. Miss Ward has used her vast material with great skill and has accomplished successfully a task which was perhaps even harder than that presented by her first volume. She has given a very clear and careful account of the history of Modernism without destroying the balance of the biographical study which was her first objective. But the larger theme of the rapid evolution of a specifically Catholic scholarship has been rather too neatly rounded off by an over-emphasis of the defects found at the beginning of the period and a too ready acceptance of the brilliance which is supposed to mark its end: at least so it seems to one who has spent almost the whole of the same period in close contact with ecclesiastical seminaries. However that may be, having read this volume twice I do not think I could point to a single dull page in all its large extent. The characters that appear must be familiar to many living Catholics and their letters will often recall the accents of old friends, while the whole narrative will engage the earnest attention of all who cherish the ideal of a Catholic information of the culture of our day.

T. E. F.

I Remember Maynooth. By Don Boyne. New and enlarged edition. (Longmans, Green & Co. Pp. 223. 5s.)

THE first edition of this charming book was reviewed in these pages a year ago (Vol. xiii, p. 313). The author has now added two new chapters and an appendix, which together are nearly as long as the original book. The additions are welcome. "Ad Vota Saecularia" describes very sympathetically the process of elimination by which some twenty *per cent* of the College entrants give up their education for the priesthood and leave Maynooth either at their own suggestion or at the instance of their superiors. The author takes this occasion, anticipating the next chapter ("The Dead Past"), to bury, let us hope for ever, the tradition of

"The Spoiled Priest". Although this chapter is full of good things and (if Don Boyne will forgive my saying so) of wise reflections, its quality is not equal to that of the rest of the book ; the writing has not the same finish. But in the next chapter of musings in the Maynooth cemetery the author is once more in complete mastery of the situation and writes as beautifully as ever. The Appendix is a review of reviews of the first edition.

The Clergy surely will not miss this book ; but I hope that the laity, both Catholic and non-Catholic, will discover it, for it will tell them better than any other book I know what an ecclesiastical seminary is really like.

T. E. F.

Memories of Charles de Foucauld, Explorer and Hermit. By Father George Gorrée. Translated by Donald Attwater. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1938. 7s. 6d.)

THE life of any Christian may become a mystery in the sense that it has no earthly explanation, because God has taken hold of it and made use of it in an unusual way. Biography must take that into account, and the best key we can hope to have to such a life is self-revelation, the unintentional autobiography of letters and intercourse with other people : the next best is a biography written by one whose life approximates most closely to that of his subject.

Pere Gorrée evidently believes this in producing "not a new life of Charles de Foucauld, but a rigorously exact record, made from clear and precise evidence of events both great and small that made up his career . . . particularly de Foucauld's own letters". He is himself a missionary monk in Morocco, well qualified to make a critical study, yet his own contribution is comparatively slight and consists of occasional paragraphs to preserve the sequence of events. For the rest, de Foucauld speaks for himself, nor need there be any misgivings that this method lacks interest. The pattern of the life is too varied for that.

The record shows the bad soldier, idle, notorious for his excesses and so defiant of discipline that he is removed from active duty. There is an interesting "natural" conversion after this. De Foucauld begs to be returned to duty, and

in Africa proves himself an intrepid soldier, indifferent to hardships. He becomes an explorer, and though not practising his religion, a serious purpose has come into his work which is never without excitement and danger, and this purpose is inconsistent with his personal life.

Abbé Huvelin knew that when he led the young explorer who asked for instruction into the confessional. From that time his vocation develops gradually until he becomes the twentieth-century Father of the Desert.

That the reader who has no experience of such extraordinary ways of life, directed by God, is carried along until he accepts without surprise the inevitable end to de Foucauld's life is clearly a testimony to the value of this refreshing kind of straight and accurate biography. Mr. Attwater's translation is as good as all the others he has done.

G. T.

Histoire des Missions Catholiques. By Paul Lesourd. (Librairie de l'Arc, Paris, 1937.)

MOST people in England who are mission-minded enough to wish to have an adequate knowledge of the world-Church they belong to can read French. It is unfortunate, however, that there should be even this restriction, for M. Paul Lesourd's new book, *Histoire des Missions Catholiques*, is by no means only a student's book of reference. In English dress it could almost be popular reading, and it would certainly be a revelation to most Catholics if it were.

The author treats his vast subject in two main parts. The first, *A travers les siècles*, gives the historical framework on which is built the Catholic world as we see it today. Each of the five sections into which this outline is divided is followed by a list of important events of the period in chronological order and, though these will probably be omitted from a first reading, they should be studied by all those—and they are far too many—whose Catholic world is so small that it begins to fade soon after leaving English shores.

The second part, *A travers le monde*, continues the historical survey, but by now the canvas is too large, and each continent, with sub-divisions into countries, is given its separate place and treatment. With this geographical division, helped out by numerous small pictures and a few

maps, the whole world, piece by piece, is given a Catholic colour. All the great missionary characters come on to the stage, though their appearance is brief. It could not be otherwise in such a book where, for example, the whole story of England and Catholicism must be told in three packed pages. This density is bound to be overwhelming, and the book cannot, therefore, be read quickly nor is it meant to be. It is much too good for that. As soon as it becomes known it will become the text-book of members of the Students' Missionary League, as well as finding a place in the libraries of priests who belong to the Missionary Union of the Clergy. All schools should have it, at least for reference. For we have simply nothing in English that can bring our knowledge of the Church up to the level of all other things that we have learnt, and until we do that there is a grave and insidious defect in our Catholic education. This book can remedy it. G. T.

Christ and Womankind. By Peter Ketter, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegetics in the Diocesan Seminary, Trèves, Germany. Translated from the second revised and enlarged edition by Isabel McHugh. (Burns Oates & Washbourne, London, 1937. Pp. xvi + 446. 18s.)

THIS book, which was published at Düsseldorf in 1935 under the title *Christus und die Frauen*, is correctly described by the publishers as "a detailed study of all that can be known about the women who came in contact with Our Lord during His life on earth", and as "a closely documented book". It is remarkably complete and well-arranged, and would provide material for a whole course of addresses on the subject.

The author, whose works *Im Lande der Offenbarung* and *Die Magdalenenfrage* (the latter recently translated into English) have been well received, devotes the first part of the present book to "The Status of Women before Christ" and has much of interest to tell us about the position of women in the heathen world and in ancient Israel. It is unfortunate that the references to the Talmud and Mishnah are for the most part made to modern works in European languages, and occasionally the argument regarding

certain passages might be disputed. Thus, it does not seem certain that the saying in *Pirke Aboth* (1, 5) "Speak not much with a woman" refers to conversation with a man's own wife (on this, see Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley's *The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1919 *in loc.*), and some of the Mishnaic prohibitions are a safeguard to chastity rather than an indication of scanty respect for womankind. Yet, on the whole, the evidence is convincingly stated.

The second part ("Christ's gifts to, and requirements of womankind") has sections dealing with Our Lord's recognition of woman's human personality, and His insistence on the oneness of the marriage bond, the purity and indissolubility of marriage, and the protection and ennoblement of motherhood. Later sections discuss Christ's royal gift to virgins, and the divine bequest of the Eucharist in its relation to women.

The third part (the longest in the book) is divided into five sections treating respectively of Jesus and His Mother, women in the story of the Holy Infancy, women in the public life of Jesus, women in His sayings and parables, and women in the story of the Passion and Resurrection. A fourth part considers briefly the holy women of the apostolic age.

As an expert in New Testament exegesis, the author contributes not a little to the interpretation of the biblical passages to which he continually refers. He is, moreover, careful to bring out the spiritual value and beauty of the sacred text, and, as he tells us, "to make the book adaptable to parochial use, to religious instruction, and retreats, but especially to use in small societies and biblical circles". His work may be very cordially recommended.

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

Thomas Becket. By Robert Speaight, (Longmans, 1938. 6s.) Pp. xi + 221. With illustrations.

THE towering figure of Becket projects itself on the screen of our mid-twelfth century history to the comparative exclusion of his contemporary churchmen, who, versatile, able and full of personality though they were, are seen as so many satellites around the central planet. The student, familiar with Foliot and John of Salisbury, Bartholomew of Exeter

and Roger of Pont l'Evêque, may regret this, but the fact remains : the life and death of St. Thomas provide all the ingredients of great drama.

The fine figure of the man, his piercing eyes and long, tapering fingers (always an indication of character and ability), his charm of manner, his rise from obscurity to a position of influence in the realm that, with the King's friendship, became one of power : all these are a presage of the career to come.

Then the splendid worldliness of his *ménage*, the versatility of his success as king's judge, knight-at-arms and ambassador provide the perfect setting for the dramatic change to personal asceticism and a fierce, single-minded devotion to the cause of the Church of which he had become the reluctant pastor.

All the vacillating stages of the story are told with admirable straightforwardness and simplicity by Mr. Speaight, the Catholic actor and producer, whose work is the outcome of a study undertaken to enable him to give the fullest meaning to the role of "Becket" in the great play of T. S. Eliot, *Murder in the Cathedral*.

The aim of this little book, then, is to "present" the Saint to the reader and not to produce an historian's final judgment on the events of his life. In other words, Mr. Speaight, as actor and writer, has one and the same purpose and succeeds admirably, throwing into relief the salient point of the whole story, viz. that it is the tragedy of Henry, not of Becket. For the former fell from the high promise of his genuine ability to moral ruin wrought by an ungovernable temper. By contrast, the fair hopes of Becket's early career, stayed during the interlude of his unclerical magnificence as Chancellor, threatened again by what seemed to others the more pernicky points of his quarrel with the king, these hopes are at length fulfilled in the Archbishop's progressively calm certainty of his position, in the secret growth of his sanctity under the fasts and watchings of his exile : "a silent work, but its effects were the surer for their secrecy." His death was no tragedy but an apotheosis, the beginning of a new life's work for the Church in England.

That work will be the more effective if we realize that Becket was no plaster saint, even after his so-called conver-

sion : to the moment of his murder the old Adam was in him—in him, but under a control that had become gradually more complete. His was a halo won by achievement. Mr. Speaight's seizure and exposition of this all-important fact make his essay a model of interpretation that can be recommended alike to the devotee and to the student of the philosophy of history.

However, the author's disclaimer of being "scientific" does not entitle him to escape criticism altogether for certain errors of judgment and carelessness of wording. He makes overmuch of the rivalry of Henry of Blois and Theobald for the office of legate (pp. 13, 39). The former's office actually lapsed with the death of Innocent II in September, 1143 ; the latter was appointed legate only after Rheims, 1148. Again (pp. 208 *seq.*) he somewhat exaggerates the effect of the Clarendon quarrel on the influence of Roman Canon Law in the English Church : a study of Dom Morey's recent *Bartholomew of Exeter* will modify this view. Then in listing the Constitutions of Clarendon, he unaccountably omits No. 14, while in declaring that the Pope condemned them (p. 156), he forgets that Alexander III allowed as "tolerable" Nos. 2, 6, 11, 13, 14, 16.

Finally, on pp. 14, 48, 91, the technical military term "obliquity" is misused ; the names Vézelay and Fréteval are misspelt (pp. 161, 169, 181) ; the archaic "weasand" is unnecessarily used for windpipe (p. 204), while his own "cismarine" on the next page obscures rather than clarifies his meaning. But these are merely some of the many minor, almost petty, criticisms of what is otherwise a finely economical study, beautifully produced.

GORDON ALBION.

The Church and Reunion. By Vincent McNabb, O.P. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne. 6s.)

FATHER McNABB has done well to collect together the many essays he has written on the subject of Reunion. Three of those reprinted are concerned with Nonconformity ; the rest are devoted to various phases of Anglican aspirations. Some of the statements made, such as that on p. 95 concerning the non-recognition of Anglican Orders by the Orthodox Eastern Church, are, unfortunately, no longer true. And it seems clear that, in his desire to understand

and sympathize with our separated brethren, Father McNabb sometimes interprets Anglican statements too generously, as when he takes a statement that "beginning from New Testament times, a primacy may legitimately be claimed for the Bishop of Rome", to mean that "the Bishops of Rome have a spiritual primacy *de jure divino*". We are quite sure the Anglican author meant no such thing.

E. C. MESSENGER.

Waterford and Lismore. A Compendious History of the United Dioceses. By Patrick Power, M.R.I.A., D.Litt., Emeritus Professor of Archaeology, University College, Cork. (Longmans, Green & Co. 7s. 6d. net.)

THIS book is a history of the parishes of Waterford and Lismore, with a fifty-three-page introduction about the dioceses.

In a preface the author tells us that attention is concentrated on penal and post-penal centuries. He also disclaims any intention of offering the present work as an adequate history. He calls it "an ordered collection of material". Each parish is dealt with, as a rule, under the headings: Pastors, Ecclesiastical antiquities and Religious houses. A number of appendices contain lists from old records. Many interesting facts are to be found in these pages, together with accounts of events of general importance, so that one obtains a very vivid idea of conditions in sub-penal times. There is certainly much material here for the historian and the novelist.

J. C. G.

FROM FOREIGN REVIEWS

(1) *Declarations of Nullity (Collectanea Mechliniensia, 1938, p. 415).* In a short note explanatory of the figures given in A.A.S. 1938, pp. 124-48, attention is called to the relatively small number of successful petitions heard before the Roman Rota in the past year, 1937. The number of decisions in favour of nullity was twenty-five. But it would be erroneous to use these figures as statistics of marriage causes throughout the whole Catholic world. The tables in the A.A.S. do not give, for example, the number of dispensations *super matrimonio rato et non consummato*, nor does it mention cases of *Pauline Privilege*. Most important of all, no statistics are given of those cases which are settled by sending them to another diocesan Officiality for the second sentence required

by law. In this connection the figures given by the diocese of Paris are of some interest, though we are not told whether the court of second instance was the Rota or a neighbouring diocese; this used to be Versailles and presumably still is. The details are taken from the *Semaine Religieuse de Paris*. The Paris Officiality pronounced fourteen declarations of nullity in 1932, seventeen in 1933, ten in 1934, eleven in 1935, ten in 1936. In 1937, out of sixty causes introduced, eight of which were *vis et metus*, eleven defective consent, one consanguinity, and two *ligamen*, thirteen were successful in obtaining a declaration of nullity. E. J. M.

(2) *Missa et Communio* (Dr. Oppenheim in *Ephemerides Liturgicae—Jus et Praxis*, Fasc. v and vi, 1938). This is a fuller and more scientific plea for the reception of Holy Communion at Mass, a subject which has occupied liturgically minded people for some time. The intimate connexion between Mass and Holy Communion is proved (a) from Christ's intention as shown in the words of Institution at the Last Supper; (b) from ecclesiastical precepts and from liturgical texts, particularly noticeable in the thought and structure of the Postcommunion prayer; (c) from the ancient practice and custom of the Church, as seen in the directions of the Ritual, in Decree VI, Sess. XXII of the Council of Trent, and in instructions of Popes and Roman Congregations. Finally, it is shown to be in the nature of things that those taking part in the sacrifice shall eat of it. If the public singing or recitation of suitable psalms and canticles, during the distribution of Holy Communion at Mass, could be restored, it would help to stress the idea that it is a public and social act intimately connected with Mass, and not merely an act of private and personal devotion. The writer avoids exaggerations, from which ardent liturgical revivalists are not always immune, but it would have completed a useful study of the subject if space could have been found for explaining the principle that Holy Communion must be given to all who seek it reasonably. The authors usually agree that, if the faithful present themselves immediately before Mass, they must never be turned away, except on the occasions when a liturgical rule expressly prohibits the practice. E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

Very Rev. Canon J. R. Crea asks us to make the following announcement :

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, BRIGHTON CONFERENCE, 1938

At the invitation of His Grace, the Archbishop-Bishop of Southwark, the 1938 Conference of the Catholic Truth Society will be held in Brighton, from 9-12 September, under the Presidency of His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. He will be supported by a majority of the Hierarchy of the country.

The Conference will be the guest of the Mayor and Corporation of the County Borough, who have placed the Dome and the Royal Pavilion at the disposal of the Committee, and who will welcome the Cardinal and his suite at a Civic Reception on the Friday evening.

The general plan of the Conference will be historical and, in a series of attractive addresses, detailed below, the inspiring story of the Church in this country will be told anew by the following well-known lecturers, each of whom is in the front rank of contemporary authorities :

Professor W. A. Pantin, M.A. ; Hilaire Belloc, K.C.S.G., M.A. ; Rev. Philip Hughes, L.S.H. ; Rev. David Mathew, M.A., Litt.D., F.S.A. ; Douglas Jerrold, M.A. ; Most Rev. Richard Downey, D.D., Archbishop of Liverpool ; Miss Maisie Ward (Mrs. F. J. Sheed) ; Fr. Martindale, S.J., M.A.

On Monday, 12 September, there will be a Banquet at 6.45 in the Corn Exchange.

At intervals throughout the Conference there will be an Exhibition dealing with the Foreign Mission, arranged by the Association for the Propagation of the Faith ; Missionary Work at home, arranged by the Catholic Missionary Society and the Southwark Travelling Mission ; also a Cinematograph Display and an exhibition of Catholic Literature, arranged by the Catholic Truth Society.

Membership of the Conference is by ticket, price two shillings and sixpence, obtainable from the Conference Office, 28 Bristol Road, Brighton. This ticket entitles the

holder to admission to all meetings (with the exception of the Banquet), to the Exhibition, and to facilities granted by the Railways and by Brighton Corporation.

CONFERENCE OFFICE.—For the actual duration of the Conference, i.e. from 9 to 12 September, an Office and Enquiry Bureau will be established in the Royal Pavilion for the greater convenience of members. Prior to 9 September, all communications should be addressed to 28 Bristol Road, Brighton, 7.

Mr. Paul Falvury writes :

In your July issue Mr. Egerton Clarke comments on my book of religious poems, *Higher Realms*. With his opinion of my "obvious adjectives and stale imagery" I am not concerned ; frankly, I do not rate him as a literary genius from whose judgment one may benefit. But Mr. Clarke pontifically condemns my suggestion that definitely religious poems should be classified apart from general poetry ; this theory he declares "hovers on the frontiers of heresy".

His anathema does not impress me, and I maintain that a reader has just cause for complaint if he purchases a book of poems under the impression that they are "general" and finds them to be occupied with dogmatic religious truth. It is folly to suppose that Aquinas has the same universal appeal as William Shakespeare.

We are asked to announce that all corrections for the 1939 *Catholic Directory* should be sent to the Editor at Archbishop's House, Westminster, London, S.W.1, as soon as possible.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

BOOKS RECEIVED

- ELECTROMAGNETICS. A Discussion of Fundamentals.** By Alfred O'Rahilly. (London : Longmans. 884 pp. 42s.)
- JEANNE D'ARC.** By Gabriel Hanotaux. (Paris : Librairie Plon. 91 pp. 3 frs.)
- HISTOIRE DES PAPES DE L'EPOQUE CONTEMPORAINE. Tome I. Première Partie : Pie VII (1800-1823.)** By J. Schmidlin. (Paris : Emmanuel Vitte. 512 pp. 75 frs.)
- THE PREMONSTRATENSIAN ABBEY OF WELBECK.** By A. Hamilton Thompson. (London : Faber & Faber. 132 pp. 12s. 6d.)
- THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN ITALIAN THOUGHT FROM CAVOUR TO MUSSOLINI.** By S. William Halperin. (Cambridge University Press and University of Chicago Press. 115 pp. 9s.)
- MEDIEVAL AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL ESSAYS IN HONOR OF JAMES WEST-FALL THOMPSON.** Edited by James Lea Cate and Eugene N. Anderson (Cambridge University Press and University of Chicago Press. 499 pp. 21s.)
- A HUNDRED YEARS OF BRITISH PHILOSOPHY.** By Dr. Rudolf Metz. (London : Allen & Unwin. 828 pp. 25s.)
- CONFERENCES OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL TO THE SISTERS OF CHARITY. Vol. I.** Translated by Joseph Leonard, C.M. (London : Burns Oates & Washbourne. 322 pp. 10s. 6d.)
- MY MASS.** By Joseph Putz, S.J. (Ranchi : Catholic Press. 77 pp. 2s.)
- PETITS ENFANTS. Histoires récréatives.** By P.M. Bernard. (Paris : Tequi. 170 pp. 9 frs.)
- THEOLOGIA BIBLICA. Vol. I : De Deo Uno.** Scripsit P. F. Ceuppens, O.P. (Romae : Collegio "Angelicum". 329 pp.)
- THE PRICELESS PEARL, OR HUMILITY OF HEART.** By Sister M. Aloysi Kiener, S.N.D. (London : Coldwell. 78 pp. 2s. 6d.)
- UNE FILLE AMERICAINE DE M. VINCENT : ANNE ELISABETH SETON.** By Jeanne Danemarie. (Paris : Grasset. 219 pp. 18 frs.)
- LA VIE EN ORDRE.** By L'Abbé Jacques Leclercq. (Bruxelles : Editions de la Cité Chrétienne. 527 pp. 33 frs.)
- THE STORY OF INSTRUCTION : THE CHURCH, THE RENAISSANCES, AND THE REFORMATIONS.** By Ernest Carroll Moore. (London : Macmillan. 575 pp. 17s.)
- THE WHOLE CHRIST. The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition.** By Emile Mersh, S.J. Translated by John R. Kelly, S.J. (London : Coldwell. 623 pp. 21s.)
- THE GLORIES OF MARY.** By S. Alphonsus de' Liguori. (London : St. Peter's Press. 286 pp. 10s. 6d.)
- THE CHURCH AT THE END OF THE FIRST CENTURY.** By the Abbé Bardy. Translated by P. W. Singleton. (London : Sands. 163 pp. 6s.)

SOME CONTRIBUTORS TO THE NEW CATHOLIC HERALD

PETER F. ANSON
G. ELLIOT ANSTRUTHER, K.S.G.
DONALD ATTWATER
REV. BERNARD BASSETT, S.J.
MICHAEL DE LA BEDOYERE
HILAIRE BELLOC
J. L. BENVENISTI
JOHN BETJEMAN
W. J. BLYTON
TANCRED BORENIUS
FRANCIS BRAND
JOHN BROWN
RT. REV. MGR. WILLIAM F.
BROWN
REV. FRANCIS BURDETT
REV. GEORGE BURNS, S.J.
EGERTON CLARKE
LORD CLONMORE
IRIS CONLAY
SUSAN CUNNINGTON
ALICE CURTAYNE
REV. MARTIN C. D'ARCY, S.J.
MICHAEL DERRICK
LORD ALFRED DOUGLAS
REV. FRANCIS H. DRINKWATER
REV. EUSTACE DUDLEY, S.J.
H. O. EVERETT
REV. DENIS FAHEY
REV. THOMAS GILBY, O.P.
ERIC GILL
G. M. GODDEN
RT. REV. MGR. GOODIER, S.J.
WALDEMAR GURIAN
M. V. HAY
F. R. HOARE
PROFESSOR JOHN HOWLEY
REV. JOSEPH H. HOWARD
RT. REV. MGR. JACKMAN
STANLEY B. JAMES
J. M. N. JEFFRIES
DOUGLAS JERROLD
HUMPHREY JOHNSON

RT. REV. MGR. RONALD KNOX
WILFRED ROOKE LEY
ARNOLD LUNN
CANON MAHONEY, D.D.
REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.
REV. GERVASE MATHEW, O.P.
MARQUIS MERRY DEL VAL
CHARLES G. MORTIMER
DOM B. McELLIGOTT, O.S.B.
PAUL B. MCGUIRE
REV. VINCENT McNABB, O.P.
DOUGLAS NEWTON
ALFRED NOYES
DR. W. O'DONOVAN
SEAN O'FAOLAIN
REV. LEO O'HEA, S.J.
PROFESSOR A. O'RAHILLY
DR. WILLIAM E. ORCHARD
RICHARD O'SULLIVAN, K.C.
REV. HUGH POPE, O.P.
REV. EDWARD QUINN
PROFESSOR LOUIS RENOUF
GERALD WYNNE RUSHTON
ROBERT SENCOURT
F. J. SHEED
WALTER SHEWRING
REV. JOHN V. SIMCOX
ROBERT SPEAIGHT
REV. ROBERT STEUART, S.J.
PROFESSOR W. F. P. STOCKLEY
HALLIDAY SUTHERLAND
PETER THOMPSON
DR. W. R. THOMPSON, F.R.S.
REV. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.
REV. GERALD VANN, O.P.
BERNARD WALL
REV. LEO WARD
W. I. WATKIN
EVELYN WAUGH
STEPHANIE WINES
REV. FRANCIS WOODLOCK, S.J.
MARGARET YEO

THE NEW CATHOLIC HERALD

Every Friday

From All Newsagents
Price 2d.

The Church's Daily Prayer

By ERNEST GRAF, O.S.B.

"The aim of this little book," writes Father Graf in his preface, "is to tell those who have no access to the many learned tomes written on this theme, something of the origin and nature of the Church's own Prayer Book." After a clear analysis of what is meant by private and by liturgical prayer, he explains in detail the history and nature of the Divine Office. In subsequent chapters he gives full and practical explanations of Matins, Lauds, Prime, the Little Hours, Vespers, and Compline and of ceremonial and liturgical prayer.

Crown 8vo, 5s.

A Modern Mystic

By AN IRISH CARMELITE

Mother Mary Teresa of the Angels, who lived from 1855 to 1930, was a French Carmelite nun who, like St. Thérèse of Lisieux, discovered the way of Spiritual Childhood, though they were unknown to each other. This biography describes her hidden life with intimate detail, and should appeal widely to that growing public who recognize the claims of the spiritual life.

Crown 8vo, 5s.

At the School of St. Thérèse

Translated by REV. MICHAEL COLLINS, A.M.

Among the many books concerning St. Thérèse of Lisieux which have appeared since her death, this new study of her spiritual writings is one of the most likely to gain a permanent place. It is a close analysis of the most significant passages of her own writings and conversations, comparing each passage in detail with similar quotations from the writings of saints and spiritual masters. The correspondence is often remarkably close, and the effect is to provide a striking confirmation of the declaration of Pius XI that "in truth God has told us many things through her who was, as it were, His living voice".

Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

Christ and Youth

By REV. NOEL GASCOIGNE, Ph.D.

Father Gascoigne is a young priest from New Zealand who has written this inspiring volume during a period of special studies at Oxford before returning to assume important educational work in his native country. He has written these essays as a spiritual handbook for young men and young women, to assist them in facing the problems of youth in a pagan modern world. The book has been written to fill an urgent need among the clergy who devote themselves to promoting Catholic Action; and it will be a valuable addition to the work of such writers as Father Martin-dale and Father Bede Jarrett, who have had a profound influence upon its author.

Foolscap 8vo. Wrapper, 1s. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

THE SMALL MISSAL

A new edition, revised and reset. Containing the Proper of the Mass for all Sundays and Principal Feasts of the Year, the Rite of Benediction, Vespers, and Compline for Sundays, Prayers for Confession and Communion, and other Devotions. The Ordinary of the Mass is printed in Red and Black and there are Illustrations.

Size $5\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{2}$ inches. 594 pages.

| No. | | | | s. | d. |
|-------|--|----|----|----|----|
| 1109 | Cloth, square corners, red edges | .. | .. | 1 | 0 |
| 1110 | Cloth, square corners, gilt edges | .. | .. | 1 | 6 |
| 1110A | Pluvis, round corners, gilt edges | .. | .. | 2 | 6 |
| 1111 | French morocco, round corners, gilt edges | .. | .. | 3 | 6 |
| 1111A | White nacrolaque, round corners, gilt edges | .. | .. | 3 | 6 |
| 1112 | Ecrasé morocco, round corners, red gilt edges | .. | .. | 4 | 0 |
| 1112A | White celluloid, round corners, red gilt edges | .. | .. | 5 | 0 |
| 1112F | Seal grain skiver, round corners, red gilt edges | .. | .. | 5 | 0 |
| 1113 | Satin grain leather, round corners, red gilt edges | .. | .. | 5 | 0 |
| 1114 | Morocco, limp, round corners, red gilt edges, gold roll | 6 | 0 | | |
| 1114A | Best morocco, limp, round corners, red gilt edges, gold roll | .. | .. | 7 | 6 |

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

RELIGIOUS BOOKS FOR CHILDREN

For Juniors and Seniors

A XVIth Century Nobleman

MARIELI BENZIGER

The most exciting stories of fiction pale beside the adventurous life-history of St. Francis Xavier, the sixteenth century Basque nobleman who became a Jesuit missionary. The thrilling account of his amazing exploits and heroism in the pursuit of souls has never been more vividly told, and in this book we follow the saint on his breath-taking adventures in India, Cannibal Islands, Japan, China, and at sea.

Illustrated. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

For Senior Girls

Whither and Why

MOTHER MARY CLARE

"Talks with older pupils of the well-known Ursuline Convent at Brentwood . . . Seldom have I come across a book of this nature which could be more unreservedly commended to girls, to teachers, to parents, to directors of girls' confraternities, and to all who value the matured views of a Religious who looks out on the world with motherly, womanly eyes—not spectacled, but frank and understanding. . . ."—FR. ALEXANDER, O.F.M., in the *Franciscan Magazine*.

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

For Juniors

Wings of Charity

Translated from the French by the LITTLE SISTERS
OF THE ASSUMPTION

An exciting story of the two Founders of the Congregation of the Little Sisters of the Assumption, Père Etienne Pernet, and Antoinette Fage (Mère Marie de Jésus), as well as of the institute itself, and of the development of the Congregation. Original in treatment, it provides children with an experience such as they have seldom, if ever, enjoyed before. The French edition (*La Pernelle et Sa Mission*) was crowned by the French Academy.

Illustrated. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

THE SHILLING LIBRARY

The new catalogue of Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne's Shilling Library, which is now ready, includes a large number of additional volumes, bringing the total published in the series to over 250.

The series is grouped under the following general headings : Holy Scripture, Apologetics, Biography, History and Travel, Devotional Books, Fiction. They vary in size but all are bound uniformly in strong crimson boards which resemble ordinary cloth binding.

Among the authors included are

ARCHBISHOP AMIGO
RENÉ BAZIN
MGR. R. H. BENSON
FR. D'ARCY, S.J.
SHANE LESLIE
HENRI JOLY

DOM BEDE CANN
ABBOT CABROL
JOSEPH CLAYTON
CARDINAL NEWMAN
ABBÉ HUVELIN
FRANCIS THOMPSON

The new additions include

THE APOCALYPSE OF ST. JOHN

Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J.

GODDESS OF GHOSTS

Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J.

ROME AND REUNION

Rev. E. C. Messenger

MUST WAR COME?

John Eppstein

FRÉDÉRIC OZANAM

Rev. J. Brodrick, S.J.

ST. PHILIP NERI

Rev. V. J. Matthews

The complete catalogue will be sent post free on request

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

Publishers to the Holy See

The PREMIER HOUSE for
CHURCH FURNITURE
WOODCARVING and
DEVOTIONAL REQUISITES

ROSARIES
STATUES
PICTURES
CARDS AND
CALENDARS—CRUCIFIXES
FONTS—FIRST COMMUNION
MEMORIALS — PRIE-DIEU
BIBLES, NEW
TESTAMENTS
PRAYER
BOOKS AND
GENERAL
CATHOLIC
LITERATURE

*Catalogues of Books, Church Furniture, and Devotional Articles
sent post free on request*

30-32 Manchester Street, Liverpool; 39 John Bright Street, Birmingham;
66-68 Bridge Street, Manchester; 248 Buchanan Street, Glasgow;
21-22 D'Olier Street, Dublin;

43-45 Newgate Street, E.C.1 LONDON 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

Publishers to the Holy See

The PREMIER HOUSE for
CHURCH FURNITURE
WOODCARVING and
DEVOTIONAL REQUISITES

ROSARIES
STATUES
PICTURES
CARDS AND
CALENDARS—CRUCIFIXES
FONTS—FIRST COMMUNION
MEMORIALS — PRIE-DIEU
BIBLES, NEW
TESTAMENTS
P R A Y E R
BOOKS AND
GENERAL
CATHOLIC
LITERATURE

*Catalogues of Books, Church Furniture, and Devotional Articles
sent post free on request*

30-32 Manchester Street, Liverpool; 39 John Bright Street, Birmingham;
66-68 Bridge Street, Manchester; 248 Buchanan Street, Glasgow;
21-22 D'Olier Street, Dublin;

43-45 Newgate Street, E.C.1 **LONDON** 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1

The Universe

*The most widely-read
Catholic paper*

THE CLERGY will find in "The Universe" the most comprehensive news of Catholic affairs throughout the world, supplied by authoritative representatives in practically every country.

THE CLERGY will find the official announcements of the dioceses of Great Britain faithfully and promptly recorded, and all news of nation-wide interest for the progress of the Catholic cause fully presented.

THE CLERGY will find representative and central Catholic opinion upon topics of the day voiced both editorially and by expert writers upon the subjects concerned.

THE CLERGY will find in "The Universe" the best medium of publicity for announcements, appeals and small advertisements.

*Its sale exceeds by many thousands the combined sale of all other
Catholic papers printed in Great Britain and Ireland.*

●
TWOPENCE WEEKLY
BY POST 12s. 6d. PER YEAR

●
184 STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2
